STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Evangelical review.
v.13 1861/1862 Evangelical review
0 0001 00658502 8

Class 205 Book Er 13

Volume 13

Pennsylvania
State Library

04-79-713-0

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol13evangelical00unse

STATE LIBRARY HARRISBURG PENNA.

THE

# EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

W. M. REYNOLDS AND M. L. STOEVER,
EDITORS.

---

"Es sei denn, dass ich mit Zeugnissen der heiligen Schrift, oder mit öffentlichen, klaren, und hellen Gründen und Ursachen überwunden und überweiset werde, so kann und will ich nichts widerrufen."—LUTHER.

---

VOL. XIII.

---

GETTYSBURG:
PRINTED BY H. C. NEINSTEDT.
1861-62.

## CONTENTS OF NO. XLIX.


| Article. | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | German Emigration to North America. By W. M. Reynolds, D. D., Springfield, Ill. | 1 |
| II. | Jephthah's Vow. | 28 |
| III. | M. Minucii Felicis Octavius. By H. W. Thorpe, A. M., Davidsonville, Md. | 34 |
| IV. | Annotations on Matth. Ch. XXIV. | 55 |
| V. | The Races of Men in English History. By Henry Coppee, A. M., Prof. in the University of Pennsylvania. | 93 |
| VI. | Beneficiary Education. | 111 |
| VII. | Theses upon the Church. Translated by Rev. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M. Professor in Pennsylvania College. | 122 |
| VIII. | Our National Crisis. | 134 |
| IX. | Hymns. By Rev. M. Loy, A. M., Delaware, Ohio. | 151 |
| X. | Notices of new Publications. | 154 |


81695

Carmina Ecclesiæ.
Discourses on Sacramental Occasions.
The Prayer-Meeting.
Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository.
The New Englander.
The Danville Quarterly.
American Theological Review.
Brownson's Quarterly Review.
The Faith once delivered to the Saints.
Discourse on the Spiritual Worship of God.
The Lutheran Church and Missions.
The Purposes of God in the American Union.
Trembling for the Ark of God.
The Threatening Ruin of our Times.
The Renovation of Politics.
Perseverance in Study.
A Brief Survey of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.
Government and Christianity.

# THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XLIX.

JULY, 1861.

## ARTICLE I.

### GERMAN EMIGRATION TO NORTH AMERICA—INTRODUCTORY TO THE HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AMONG THE GERMANS AND THEIR DESCENDANTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

By William M. Reynolds, D. D.

German emigration to North America is involved in almost as much obscurity as the movements of their Teutonic ancestors, from the highlands of Central Asia, to the shores of Western Europe. A patriotic German * has undertaken to prove, not only that there was a German among the Scandinavian discoverers of America in the eleventh century, but that the celebrated Nurenberg geographer, Martin Behaim, had made a voyage to America in 1483, nearly ten years before Columbus landed upon San Salvador. The former point may be regarded as well established, but the most recent investigations render it certain that Behaim never saw America.† The first authentic account which we have of German emigration to the New World, is that of the colonization of Venezuela, in South America, under the direction of Welser, a wealthy merchant of Augsburg. Having obtained a grant of that territory from the Emperor, Charles V., he sent out, in 1526, three ships, with five hundred soldiers, and a company of traders, under the command of Ambrose Alfinger of

*Franz Löher, "Geschichte und Zustände der Deutschen in Amerika." —Cincinnati, 1847.

†"Martin Behaim, the German Astronomer and Cosmographer." By John G. Morris, D. D., p. 23.—Baltimore, 1855.

Ulm. A fort was erected and a town laid, and a crowd of adventurers was soon attracted from various parts of Germany. Unfortunately, however, as in so many other plans of colonization, the emigrants wasted their time in hunting for gold mines instead of applying themselves to the regular pursuits of industry and commerce. Still, a profitable traffic with the natives was carried on, and it was only by the changes and disasters of the thirty years' war, and the separation of Germany from Spain by the death of the Emperor, Charles V., that this colony was finally broken up, after an existence of Thirty Years. Had the political union between Germany and Spain continued, Germany would undoubtedly have taken a more prominent part in the early colonization of the western world. Even without this, considerable bodies of Germans, merchants, laborers and agriculturalists, have settled themselves in South America and the West India Islands, alike under the Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, English, French, Danish and Mexican governments.

We propose, however, to confine our attention to the German population of North America. Here Germans first make their appearance in the Dutch colony of the New Netherlands.* It is probable that among the eighteen languages which Father Jogues† speaks of as being heard in New Amsterdam, in 1643, the German was also employed. The propinquity of Holland to Germany, and the natural relations of the two people, could scarcely fail to attract some German adventurers to the Dutch colonies in the New World. Very few however, seem to have found their way to the New Netherlands, before its transfer to the English. In a list of six or seven hundred grants of land made by the colonial authorities, between 1630 and 1664,‡ we recognize but four or five

*Although it is true that Gustavus Adolphus had in 1624 invited Germany to take part in his proposed colony upon the Delaware, and Oxenstiern in 1633 made especial efforts in the same direction, as may be seen in the "Mercurius Germaniae," published in the same year (1633) by the order of the latter great statesman, yet Löher's statement in his "Geschichte der Deutschen," pp. 26—31, that the Germans formed a material part of the first Dutch colony on the Hudson, and the principal part of that of the Swedes on the Delaware, is unsupported by facts. Out of 190 families, containing over 900 individuals, the descendants of the first Swedish colonies upon the Delaware, in 1693, not half a dozen have German names, and even of these few some are known to have been natives of Sweden. See the lists in Acrelius, pp. 217—221.

†Documentary Hist. N. York, Vol. III.

‡See the lists in O'Callaghan's Hist. N. Neth. Vol. II, pp. 569 and 581 to 593.

that can be regarded as held in German names. The rolls of the burgher guards (four companies) for 1653 contain but a single German name, and not a single German appears among the colonists of Rensellaerswyck from 1630 to 1646.* But a few German names from time to time make their appearance. In 1646 Abram Planck, and some others, who may also have been Germans, received a grant of land upon the South River, as the Delaware was then called. As this date coincides with the first occupation of Alsace by the French, it is highly probable that they were fugitives from the persecutions to which Protestants were, thenceforward, subject in that unhappy country, which many were thus compelled to leave. In 1660, Jacob Leisler, who played so important a part in the English colonial history of New York, came over as a soldier in the service of the Dutch West India Company.

The fate of this man forms an interesting episode in the colonial history of New York, and has not hitherto received the attention which it merits. He himself tells us,† that he was a German and a Protestant. He appears to have been a native of Frankfort on the Mayn, and fell a victim to his devotion to the Protestant cause. Being a man of great energy of character, and having accumulated a large amount of property, he gradually became one of the leading men of the colony under the English government. The influence of James the Second was naturally very great in the province of New York, which had been a private possession of his, whilst Duke of York and before his accession to the English throne. It was not strange, therefore, that when he undertook to subvert, at the same time, both the English constitution and the Protestant faith of the British Empire, he found ready tools among the creatures, to whose hands he had committed the government of his own province of New York. But the population of the country was essentially Protestant and soon shared in the general alarm and disgust excited by the machinations of James in all parts of his dominions. They, therefore, sympathized most heartily with the movement for expelling James from the throne, and hailed with acclamations of joy the resolution of 1688, by which William and Mary were invested with the government of Great Britain. To the patriotic Hollanders of New York, and their descendants, the accession of William of Orange, a

*Ibidem I, pp. 433 to 441. †Documentary Hist. N. Y., II, 9.

prince of their own race, was doubly welcome. But the partizans of James, in New York, were by no means inclined to surrender their power and that of the perfidious monarch, from whom they had derived it. Under the administration of Governor Dongan, a Roman Catholic, a large body of papists had settled in the province of New York, as well as a considerable number of members of the church of England. None of these were favorably disposed towards the Prince of Orange and the principles which he represented. But it was in vain that Lieutenant Governor Nicholson, to whom Dongan had confided the government just before the news of the revolution reached New York, even with the aid of this party, so considerable both by its wealth and its official position, endeavored to stem the tide of public opinion and popular enthusiasm for the revolution. Under the guidance of Leisler, the great body of the aroused people were now organized for efficient action. His military experience at once pointed him out as their leader, and he promptly seized and garrisoned the fort with his citizen soldiers. Issuing a proclamation suitable to the exigencies of the times, legal order and a provisional government, in the name of William and Mary, were at once established under his auspices. But this state of things, an almost democratic movement, was anything but welcome to the minions and adherents of the exiled James. They refused to acknowledge the government established by Leisler, whom they denounced as a usurping revolutionist. The chief strength of this opposition was at Albany, Leisler's influence being irresistible in New York. The English government, still to a great extent, under the influence of the unprincipled friends of James II., in 1690, sent over Col. Sloughter, a man of infamous character, as the Governor of New York. Around him, even before he landed, the enemies of Leisler were at once gathered, ready to plot his ruin. Without showing his authority, Sloughter commanded Leisler to surrender the government of the province into his hands. To this the acting governor naturally demurred, but finally, when satisfied that Sloughter was really appointed to the station, complied with his demands. Notwithstanding this, and in defiance of the clearest evidence that Leisler had, at all times, acted in the interest of the government just established under William and Mary, he was impeached for high treason in the provincial court, over which Sloughter presided, declared guilty, and put to death as a traitor to that king and country whom he had only too faithfully served.

Such was the end of one of the most successful asserters of Protestanism and popular rights in the American colonies of Great Britain, prior to the great movement of 1775. Five years later, (1695) the sentence pronounced against Leisler was reversed by act of Parliament, and his estates which had been confiscated were restored to his family.*

German emigration to New York continued steadily to increase under the English government, which, with all its faults, has always been more favorable to the intermingling of other nations, and more liberal in its colonial policy than the Dutch. In the list of inhabitants in the city of New York, who took the oath of allegiance to the British government soon after its surrender in 1664, we find but two or three names of Germans, of which Jacob Leisler is one.† But in a similar list for Ulster county, in 1689, the number is considerably greater, so that we find there the names of Mart. Hofferman, (Hoffman) Joh. Schencke, Lander Roesinkranc, (Rosenkranz) Matt. and Corn. Slecht, (Schlecht) John Middag, (Mittag) John J. Stoll, Dirrich Keizer, and several others who were in all probability Germans.‡ So also in the list of the persons killed or taken captive by the French and Indians at the burning of Schenectady, in 1690, there occur a few names of Germans.§

Somewhat anterior to this period, even as early as 1680, two years before William Penn's arrival, Germans had begun to make their appearance in the country, since called Pennsylvania. Among these was Henry Frey, whose wife was still living in 1754,‖ and one Plattenback, who arrived a couple of years later. Penn, immediately upon his acquisition of the province, commenced his efforts to colonize it, and one of his first steps was to invite his German friends¶ and others, who were suffering from religious persecution, or desired to engage in such an enterprise with a view of improving their fortunes, to join him in his undertaking. Some seem immediately to have availed themselves of this invitation, as Germans are mentioned in the proceedings of the first legislative assembly of the province, which was held in

*Bancroft, Hist. U. S., III, 55. †Documents, Vol. III, 74—77.

‡Documentary History, I, 279—282. §Ibid. I, 304—306.

‖Hallische Nachrichten, Achte Fortsetzung, p. 665.

¶Penn had visited Germany as far as Westphalia in 1677 and '78, and made some converts to his doctrines in Cressheim and Haslochin, the vicinity of Worms. Löher ubi supra, p. 37.

1682, as already possessed of the full rights of citizenship.* On the 20th of August of the following year, Francis Daniel Pastorius landed in Philadelphia with twenty families of Germans, sent out by the Land-company of Frankfort on the Mayn, which finally purchased a large body of land (nearly 28,000 acres) for the colonization of their friends and associates in faith, in the district now occupied by the Germantown district of Philadelphia. These were mostly Mennonites, many of whom, however, adopted the Quaker notions of Penn. Pastorius, who led them over, was a native of Sommershausen, near Limburg in Franconia, and although at that time only thirty years of age, had taken his degree as a Doctor of Laws, and is represented as a fine classical scholar, and a theologian, especially well versed in the church fathers. His father had occupied the position of a Counsellor of State in Brandenburg, and was quite a distinguished writer of history.† Pastorius was the first Mayor of Germantown from its foundation, in 1685, until 1708, when he was succeeded in his peaceful post by Daniel Falkner. Thus Philadelphia and Germantown and the surrounding country soon became a great centre, around which German emigrants of all classes and all confessions, rapidly gathered, and whence they gradually extended their settlement into the surrounding country. Even as early as 1703, we find a considerable body of Germans in Montgomery county, as far as "The Swamp," which received its name of "Falkner's Swamp" from the first German Lutheran minister who officiated in North America, and who was in that year ordained for this purpose by the Swedish Lutheran ministers in the old Swedes' church in Philadelphia.‡

By this time, the beginning of the eighteenth century, all Germany was aroused to the subject of emigration to America. Especially was this the case in the Palatinate,§ which had, ever since 1560, been the scene of religious persecution, first of Lutherans by the Calvinistic Electors, and then of

*Proud, Hist. of Pennsylvania, p. 220.

†Löher ubi supra, p. 40. ‡See above, p. 40.

§The Lower Palatinate, generally called simply "the Palatinate," (in German, "Die Pfalz,") was situated upon both sides of the Rhine, and embracing a territory of 1600 square miles, included not only the country at present so called, and under the government of Bavaria, but also parts of territories, now incorporated with Prussia, Baden, Nassau and some other states.

both Lutherans and Calvinists by the French Jesuits and Romish Electors. The Elector, John Casimir, forcibly expelled all Lutheran professors from the University of Heidelberg, deposed and banished the Lutheran pastors and preachers, and made the Calvinistic or Reformed Church, the religion of the State. But the Lutherans still maintained their ground and even increased in numbers and strength during a century of persecution which they suffered at the hands of their Reformed brethren. But when, in 1673, Louis the Fourteenth invaded and desolated the Palatinate, (he had already, in 1665, seized upon the greater part of Alsace,) both Reformed and Lutherans were involved in the same misfortunes. The celebrated Marshal Turenne was here guilty of cruelties which have deeply sullied his great name. But the injuries which he inflicted were merciful, compared with the atrocities perpetrated by Duras, under the direction of Louis and his savage minister, Louvois, in 1688 and 1689. In the graphic language of Macaulay,* "Duras received orders to turn one of the fairest regions of Europe into a desert. The French commander announced to near half a million of human beings, that he granted them three days of grace, and that within that time they must shift for themselves. Soon the roads and fields, which then lay deep in snow, were blackened by innumerable multitudes of men, women and children, flying from their homes. Many died of cold and hunger, but enough survived to fill all the cities of Europe with lean and squalid beggars, who had once been thriving farmers and shop-keepers. * * The flames went up from every market-place, every hamlet, every parish church, every county-seat within the devoted provinces. The fields where the corn had been sown were ploughed up. The orchards were hewn down. No promise of a harvest was left on the fertile plains near what had once been Frankenthal. Not a vine, not an almond-tree, was to be seen on the slopes of the sunny hills round what had once been Heidelberg. No respect was shown to palaces, to temples, to monasteries, to infirmaries, to beautiful works of art, to monuments of the illustrious dead. The far-famed castle of the Elector Palatine, was turned into a heap of ruins. The adjoining hospital was sacked. The provisions, the medicines, the pallets on which the sick lay were destroyed. The very stones, of which Manheim had been built, were

*History of England, III, 112.

flung into the Rhine. The magnificent cathedral of Spires perished, and with it the marble sepulchres of eight Cæsars. The coffins were broken open. The ashes were scattered to the winds." Scarcely had Heidelberg been rebuilt and the semblance of order been restored in the country to which its scattered inhabitants had returned upon the invitation of their conquerors, when the same scenes were (in 1693) re-enacted. To all this was soon added the horrors of religious persecution by the combined powers of their native prince and the French conqueror. The same year (1685) in which the edict of Nantes, which guaranteed religious liberty to the French nation, was revoked, a Roman Catholic (Gustavus Leopold, of the Zweibrücken line,) became the hereditary prince of the Palatinate. During the French occupation Louis transferred to German soil the horrors of his unmerciful dragonnades. Swarms of Jesuits and other priests, booted and spurred missionaries, leaving the sword and the blunderbuss as arguments to enforce conviction, swarmed in every town, and intruded into every house, both in city and country, not only in the Palatinate, but also in Alsace, the conquest of which Louis had completed by treacherously seizing Strasburg, during a truce in 1681.*

The peace of Ryswich, (1697,) although it was expected to set limits to the encroachments and ravages of France, or rather of its rapacious monarch, and for a time removed his desolating legions from the Palatinate and neighboring regions of Germany, by no means terminated the sufferings of the persecuted Protestants. On the country, this very treaty laid the foundation for new difficulties, and afforded a pretext for the continuance of old oppressions and the infliction of new grievances. The fourth article contained the insidious clause, "*Provided, however, that the Roman Catholic religion shall remain in the places thus restored, in the condition in which it now is.*"† The French having, during their possession of the German territories, forcibly suppressed the exercise of Protestantism, and established Romanism as completely as they could, and the apostate Elector of the Palatinate, imitating their example, the grossest injustice was perpetrated by this provision, which only the criminal carelessness of the Protestant negotiators could have permit-

*Menzel, Hist. Germ., II, 491.

†"Religione tamen Catholica Romana in locis sic restitutis, in statu quo, nunc estremanente." Heinsius, "Historia Ecclesiast.," II, 1163.

ted to be incorporated with the treaty.* Its effect was to rob the Lutherans, especially, of several hundred churches, and the Reformed suffered in the same way from an edict of the Elector Palatine, John William, which was called the "Simultaneum," and decreed that all their churches should be used in common by them and the Romanists. In the same way also, the Protestants were deprived of their church-lands and funds for the support of their pastors and schools.

Philip of the Pfalz, also enforced the maxim, "*Cujus regio, ejus religio,*" ("the ruler determines the religion of his territory,") and imitated Louis XIV. in his tyranny towards his Protestant subjects, who emigrated from their wretched country in great numbers. Louis, notwithstanding the peace, marched troops into the district of Mümpelgard, in Würtemberg, in 1799, and there established the services and forms of the Romish church. At the same time the Jesuits recommenced the persecution of those, whom they denounced as heretics, in all the imperial provinces, especially in Silesia, which was abandoned by numbers of its native inhabitants.†

In the midst of all these difficuties, the war of the "Spanish Succession,"‡ as it is commonly termed, broke out, and the countries bordering on the Rhine were again and again overrun, now by the invading armies of France, and then by the opposing armies of the allies. This war lasted until 1712, so that for more than half a century the devoted inhabitants of the countries on both sides of the Rhine, from the Doubs to the Waal, and from the sources of the Danube to the Elbe, were kept in constant alarm and excitement; their cities burnt, their fields ravaged, their citizens slaughtered, their temples desecrated, and almost every form of suffering and wretchedness made familiar to them. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that thousands and tens of thousands should have their thoughts directed to the possibility of reaching some peaceful asylum where they might hope to be secure from these attacks of merciless enemies, where they might worship God according to the dictates of conscience, and where they might

*Many of the Protestant parties to this treaty declared that they had never heard of any such proposition, and protested against it in the most solemn manner.

†Menzel, Hist. of Germany, II, 503.

‡The object of this war was to prevent the union of the thrones of France and Spain, which was another object of the ambition of Louis XIV.

have some prospect of reaping the fruits of their labors, and providing for their wives and children, at least, the necessaries of life. Already in 1672, when Louis XIV, at the height of power, was carrying everything before him, and before the people of Holland had determined to trust their country to the mercy of the sea rather than of a savage conqueror, the heroic William of Orange had proposed to his countrymen, that if they could in no other way maintain their independence, they should, like the Athenians of old, embark on board their fleet and sail to their East Indian possessions, where they would be beyond the reach of their powerful and implacable enemy. But the American colonies of Great Britain were now stretched from the neighborhood of Florida to the St. Lawrence, and the capacities of that part of the continent, its vast extent, its beauty, its fertility and its healthful climate were beginning to be understood. England and Holland, united, had complete command of the sea, and their immense military and commercial marine was capable of transporting any number of emigrants who might be disposed to seek new homes in that distant clime. The sagacious Gustavus Adolphus, of Sweden, had already, in 1624, directed the attention of Germany to American colonization as "a refuge for the wives and daughters of persecuted Protestants," and now the time had arrived when this prolific idea of the great statesman was to bear abundant fruit among the people upon whose attention it had been especially urged. The emigrants, who had gone from the neighborhood of Cleves and Worms to Pennsylvania, sent back the most favorable account of their new home, its soil, its climate and its laws.* They were assured that peace, plenty, liberty of conscience and every earthly blessing awaited them in the New World. In 1707, the vicinity of Landau, in the southern part of the Palatinate, was again laid waste, and the congregation of a young Lutheran pastor, named Joshua Kocherthal, were among the severest sufferers. Flying with his wife and three children first to Holland and then to England, he proved to be another Joshua to lead his country men, not across the Jordan, but over the wide Atlantic, into a new Canaan. Arriving in London with some forty members of his flock, he there became acquainted with the

*See "Prof. Daniel Falkner, Nachrichten von Pennsylvanien, Frankfurt, 1702, and "Melch. Adam Pastorius Beschreibung von Pennsylvanien," Frankfurt u. Leipsic, 1704.

Rev. Antony William Boehme, who was, at that time, chaplain to Prince George of Denmark, the husband of the reigning Queen Anne,* with whom also he appears to have possessed great influence even after the death of her consort. Encouraged and supported by Boehme, Kocherthal presented a petition to the Queen wherein he requested, that he and his flock might be settled in some part of the British possessions in America. This petition the Queen referred to the "Lords Commissioners of Trades and Plantations," by whom American colonial affairs generally were managed, with an intimation of her pleasure that they should give it a favorable answer. This they accordingly did in a report dated the 28th of April, 1708.† This report, (signed by Lord Stanford, Ph. Meadows and Herbert J. Pulteney) after recapitulating the number and character of the petitioners, and the misfortunes which they suffered at the hands of the French, proceeds to state that careful inquiries had been made in regard to the characters of both ministers and people, and that they were found to be unblemished, and passes on to give certain reasons for settling them in New York rather than in Jamaica or Antego (Antigua), as had been at first proposed. It was suggested that the climate of New York, being more like that of their native country, was better suited to their constitution, and that they might be presented with the usual quantity of ground (forty acres) given to emigrants upon Hudson's River, where they might also be usefully employed in the production of naval stores, and "as a frontier against the French and their Indians." It was also recommended to send them over to America in the transport-ships which were to accompany Lord Lovelace, who was just going out to New York as its Governor, and also to supply them with tools for agricultural purposes, as well as with provisions for a year after their arrival, or until they could reap the crops which they were to cultivate for their subsistence. Provision was, likewise, to be made for the support of a school and church, by the donation of a glebe of 500 acres. Mr. Kocherthal was to be allowed to sell a part of the glebe for his present support in New York, besides which, the Queen likewise gave him a gratuity of £20 for his outfit. The whole party were made "free denizens" of England, that is, invested with cer-

*See Heinsius, Kirchen Historie I, p. 583.

†See the report in the "Documentary History of New York," Vol. III, pp. 541–543, Albany, 1850.

tain rights of citizenship, guaranteeing to them the protection of the State, and were also furnished with provisions for their voyage.

Whilst Kocherthal and his company were preparing for their voyage, another small party of German fugitives, fourteen in number, arrived in London, three of them from Holstein, the others from the Palatinate, where they had the year before, been involved in the same misfortunes of the French invasion. On their behalf Kocherthal addressed a second petition to the Queen, to which she gave an equally gracious answer, recommending the Lords of Trade to extend to them the same liberal provision that had already been made for their countrymen.*

Being compelled to wait upon the movements of the Royal Governor, Lord Lovelace, who was to take out with him his wife and family, and to be honored and protected by a considerable fleet, it was several months before this little company could start upon the voyage, to which they must have looked forward with so much anxiety. At length, however, towards the beginning of October, 1708, they embarked in a transport, called the Globe, and set sail for New York. This little party, who may be considered as the pioneers of the German Lutheran Church in New York, consisted of the following fifty-three persons: The pastor, Joshua Kocherthal, his wife Sibylla, and three children; Lawrence Schwisser, wife and child; Henry Rennau, his wife and her two unmarried sisters, and two children; Andrew Volck, wife and three children; Michael Weigand, wife and three children; Jacob Weber, wife and two children; Jacob Pletel, wife and three daughters; John Fischer, wife and son; Melchior Guelch, wife and two daughters; Isaac Tuerch, a young man of twenty-three, and unmarried; Peter Rose and his wife; Maria Wemarin,† a widow and her daughter two years of age; Isaac Faber, wife and son; Daniel Fiere, wife and two sons, and Herman Schueneman, who was from Holstein, the rest of his countrymen having found situations in the family of Lord Lovelace. In this ship there was also a body of soldiers, just recruited for the army in America. Their

*Documents relative to the Colonial History of New York, Vol. V, pp. 44, 52, 53, 54.

†Mr. Rupp tells us (in the Introduction to his "Thirty Thousand Names," p. XV.) this lady was the mother of Daniel Fiere, but as her age is given in the official list at 37, and his at 34, there must be a mistake somewhere.

voyage was rough, but somewhat expeditious for the times, continuing for about ten weeks. Lord Lovelace reached New York on the 18th of December, 1708, and the Germans shortly after. They had suffered chiefly for the want of water, for which they had signalled their consorts at sea, but could obtain no relief from them, in consequence of the stormy weather.* The weather was also extremely cold, so that Lord Lovelace wrote home to the Government, that, in his opinion, no ship ought to be sent from England to New York after the close of August.

Safely landed in New York, the emigrants were very kindly treated by the local authorities, to whom they had been recommended in very strong terms by the home government as well as by the new Governor. As the season was so far advanced, they could not go on to the lands which had been promised to them until the following spring. In the mean time they were supported by the Queen's liberality, each person receiving a daily allowance of 9d, the clergyman being, likewise, provided with house rent and fuel, which was continued to those who needed it for nearly two years.† As soon as the spring opened, the whole party were sent up to the lands which had in the interval been selected for them, and were furnished with the most necessary tools for erecting their houses, clearing their lands, and cultivating their gardens. Most of them were farmers, though many had also been engaged in the cultivation of the vine upon the sunny hill-sides which border the Rhine in their native land, but there was also among them a fair proportion of mechanics—one blacksmith, one carpenter, one weaver and one stocking-maker.

The lands given to this first company of Palatines, were situated on the west bank of the Hudson, about sixty miles above the city of New York, in what was then called Ulster, but is now Orange county, in the neighborhood of the present town of Newburg. The hilly and mountainous character of this part of the State, commonly called the Highlands, is well known. But the little colony was settled upon a stream then called Quassaich, but now Chambers' creek, where they had the advantage of meadow-lands as well as the uplands. Although the soil of this region is not equal in fertility to

*See a letter of Lord Lovelace, in the "Documents rel. to the Col. Hist.," Vol. V, p. 67.

†Documentary History of N. Y., III, pp. 544—551.

some of the more level and alluvial districts, and is better adapted to grazing than to the culture of grain, yet its salubrity, its situation upon the Hudson and its nearness to New York and Albany, made it one of the most eligible locations in the province. Here were all the elements of temporal prosperity, but, unfortunately, religious dissensions, the seeds of which, as we have already seen, had been so widely sown in their native land, here again broke forth, and finally separated this little community. A portion of the second party, on whose behalf Kocherthal had so kindly petitioned the Queen of England, and for whom he had obtained the same advantages as for his own parishoners, appear to have been members of the Reformed Church, could not harmonize with the doctrines of the Lutheran pastor, and finally, about the year 1712, withdrew from the settlement. Most of them, as Isaac Tuerch, Madam Wemar, Isaac Faber and Daniel Fiere, seem to have removed to Pennsylvania, where their descendants are still to be found.* In 1719, those who had continued upon the lands where they were originally settled, received deeds for them, at the rate of fifty acres for each member of the family, together with the glebe of 500 acres, making altogether 2,190 acres thus appropriated to their use and given to them in fee simple. Shortly before the deeds were made out, pastor Kocherthal had deceased, but his widow and children received their full share of 250 acres. At this time there were only twenty-seven of the original party residing upon their lands, some of them having already sold out their claims, as was also done by the remainder by the year 1751, by which time none of the original settlers, or their descendants, were to be found in that neighborhood. The reason of this appears to have been that they preferred selling off their poorer lands and removing to more fertile districts, where their countrymen and members of the same church were more numerous. In doing this, they unfortunately sacrificed their glebe-land, which had by this time become very valuable, and upon which the grasping provincial church of England had, at an early day, set its heart.† Although the glebe was granted "for the maintenance of a Lutheran minister, and his successors forever," and "for the

*Isaac Tuerch obtained a grant of land in Berks county, Pa. as early as 1712. See Rupp's "Thirty Thousand Names, p. XVII, Gen. Introd.

†For some of the most important facts in regard to this controversy relative to the Newburg glebe-lands, see O'Callaghan's "Documentary History of New York," Vol. III, pp. 576 and 583 to 603.

sole and proper use, benefit and behoof of a Lutheran minister, to serve and have care of the inhabitant, of the same two thousand one hundred and ninety acres of land," the Episcopalians, favored by the colonial authorities, finally, in 1752, took possession of it and appropriated it to the use of their church—one of the most flagrant of those acts by which they finally excited against them the indignation of the colonists, and prepared the way for the great movement of the Revolution of 1776, by which their church was almost swept from the United Colonies, which then became the United States of North America.

The news of Kocherthal's kind reception in England, and the arrangement made for conveying him and his friends to America, spread rapidly through Germany, and awakened a strong desire in multitudes to reach the same asylum, which many, doubtless, pictured to themselves as an earthly paradise. Besides this, various speculators were now anxious to obtain settlers for large tracts of land, which they had purchased in America upon condition of transporting to them a certain number of colonists within a given time. Among these were Christopher de Graffenried and Lewis Michelle, from the Canton of Berne, in Switzerland,* who had already, in 1706, purchased from the Lords Proprietors of North Carolina ten thousand acres of land between the river Neuse and Cape Fear, in virtue of which, Graffenried was, in accordance with Locke's feudal Constitution of North Carolina, created a Baron. It was, perhaps, these gentlemen, or their agents, who had various books scattered over Germany, and especially in the Palatinate, giving the most glowing descriptions of America in general, and North Carolina in particular. One of these, with Queen Anne's picture as a frontispiece, and the title page printed in letters of gold, was called "The Golden Book," and urged the persecuted Palatines to come to England, assuring them of Her Majesty's protection and liberal provision for all their necessities.† But the terrible winter of 1709, seemed to fill up the measure of suffering in the Palatinate, and increased a thousand fold the motives for emigration. Western Europe had never before known such intense cold. The birds froze

*Williamson's History of N. Carolina, I, p. 178.

†See the Journal of the House of Commons, XVI, 596 et seq., where we have a Parliamentary investigation of the causes leading to the emigration of the Germans to Great Britain.

in the air and beasts in the forest, and multitudes of men perished from the combined effects of cold and hunger. Even olives and vines and fruit-trees perished; the winter grains were destroyed, and everything portended a fearful aggravation of the famine from which France and Germany were at this time already suffering.

As soon as the roads were passable, in the spring of 1709, vast numbers were already prepared to enter upon their journey; and as the season advanced, it appeared as though the whole Palatinate, as well as many of the adjacent countries, were to be emptied of their inhabitants. Masses of men, women and children, poured down towards the Rhine and the North Sea, seeming, as they moved onward, to gather and swell like the increasing waters of some mighty river. They came up from the extremities of Alsace, and from every part of the valley of the Moselle; from the Black Forest of Baden, where the Danube rises; from Wirtemberg along the Neckar; from the Upper Palatinate, which is watered by the Noab, one of the tributaries of the Danube; from the old Franconian Circle, through which the Mayn meanders, before it reaches Darmstadt and Hesse, Hanau and Frankfurt, whence, also, many entered upon their long pilgrimage. Multitudes also came from Westphalia, from the valleys of the Ruhr and the Lippe; from Nassau, which the Lahn waters, and from the Archbishopric of Mayence, as well as from every other country of their fatherland cursed by priestly tyranny or by religious bigotry. Not only whole families, but whole villages, the pastor and his flock, the farmer, the vine-dresser, the mechanic and the miner, started upon their course as if by one common impulse. Such had been their sufferings in the past, and so dark were their prospects for the future, that they could no longer hesitate to sever the ties that bound them to their native land. And yet, as the spring opened upon them, and summer began once more to clothe their native hills and vales with verdure and with beauty, they could not fail to cast many a fond and lingering look at the land which they were leaving, as they supposed, forever. But a ruthless enemy had taken possession of their native fields, their towns and cities were in ruins, their houses and homes were still reeking with blood and smoking from the torch of the foreign incendiary, and even their native prince, who should have protected them as a father, was often more cruel than the hired mercenary of the foreign invader. Thus

rudely were the ties, that should have bound them to home and native land, severed.

Many of them, embarking with the fragments of their little worldly property upon the Rhine, floated down its ever-widening and deepening current, amid its picturesque or sublime scenery, its vine-clad hills, still beautiful, though stripped of much of their former verdure by the late inclement winter; its castled crags, which still frowned in feudal pride over the quiet valleys below them, its once magnificent cities, wealthy towns and smiling villages, until they reached the low lands of Holland, and then, by the Waal, the Lech, the Vecht, or some of its canals, reached Amsterdam, or Rotterdam, or Leyden, or some other of its great ports, where they expected to find vessels which would convey them over the North Sea to England. Others performed their long and weary pilgrimage on foot, and finally arrived, heart-sick and travel-soiled, and often without a groschen in their pockets, at the same points. But their Dutch kinsmen, then allied with the Emperor of Germany and with England, in the attempt to check the aggressions of Louis XIV, received these exiles for the most part with kindness, and for the transportation of many to England, provision was already made.

But for the appearance of such an immense body of poor and helpless strangers, neither the English Government nor the English people were at first prepared. There were not public houses enough in London for their reception, and, if there had been, the poor refugees had but little wherewith to repaythe generally exorbitant demands of an English hostelry. They were, therefore, compelled to encamp in the open air, at Blackheath, in the neighborhood of London. Hither they continued to come, from day to day and from week to week, until upwards of forty thousand are said to have been there, encamped at one time. The appearance of so large a body of foreigners, employing a language which they could not understand, at first excited the prejudices and jealousy of the ignorant London populace, and the subject was even introduced into the House of Commons.* But British benevolence and generosity soon triumphed over these narrow prejudices, and collections were soon taken up, throughout England, for the benefit of these poor and persecuted Protestants, which in a short time amounted to one pound sterling a

*Journal of the House of Commons, Vol. XVI, p. 596, et seq.

head, for young and old, Commissioners having been appointed, by the Queen, for its collection and disbursement. Parliament, also, granted ten thousand pounds (fifty thousand dollars) for their immediate relief, and still larger sums, subsequently for their transportation to the places in which they were finally settled, and for their support there, until they could provide for themselves. For their permanent relief and settlement, various plans were proposed. Some were embarked for the Scilly Isles, but after living for some weeks in their ships, were again landed, fortunate, no doubt, in never reaching those barren island. Three or four thousand were sent to Ireland, where they received a liberal grant of lands, in the county of Limerick, in the neighborhood of Arbela and Adair, and in the town of Rathkeale, where their descendants still reside, retaining their language and their religion, and, distinguished by German thrift, have become the most prosperous farmers in that part of Ireland, where they are still known by the name of "German Palatines."*

Graffenried and Michelle proposed to the Queen's Commissioners to transport one hundred families to their lands in North Carolina, and there give each family two hundred and fifty acres of land, which they were to enjoy, for five years, free of all charge, after which they were to pay an annual rent, of two pence per acre; they were also to be furnished with provisions for twelve months, for which they were to pay at the end of the following year, and were to be furnished gratis, with the tools necessary for the erection of their houses. It was, also, stipulated that they should be provided, within four months after their arrival, with a certain number of cows, hogs and sheep, for which they were to pay at the end of seven years; half of their increase being, also, given to the proprietors, by way of interest for their outlay of money. The Royal Commissioners allowed Graffenried and Michelle five pound sterling per head, for transporting their emigrants to North Carolina, and the simple-hearted Germans (amount-

*Wolfgang Menzel, in his "History of Germany," (Vol. III, pp. 446, and 447, Bohn's ed.), has fallen into some singular and almost unaccountable mistakes, which do but little credit to his accuracy as an historian. He represents "numbers as perishing from starvation in England —the survivors compelled to work like slaves in mines, and in the cultivation of uninhabited islands—sent over to Ireland, where they swelled the number of beggars"—statements which have scarcely a shadow of truth in them. His note on page 449 is also ludicrously false in its main statements.

ing, in all, to six hundred and fifty) put their share of the public collections, amounting to one pound each, into the hands of Graffenried and Michelle, to be refunded upon their arrival in America.* Leaving England sometime in October, they reached the mouth of the Neuse in December, 1709, ascending which, to the point where the Trent flows into it, they there landed and encamped, until they could erect houses for themselves. This is the origin of the town of Newbern, which received its name from the native place of Graffenried, the chief of this expedition. But Graffenried was a needy adventurer, and soon abandoned the enterprise and returned to Switzerland, leaving the poor emigrants to shift for themselves, and without any kind of titles for their lands, which he had mortgaged to Thomas Pollock, for eight hundred pounds sterling. The mortgage not being paid off, Pollock's heirs finally took possession of their lands, but the poor settlers were, in some measure, indemnified by a grant of ten thousand acres of land, which the British Government gave them, free from all rents and taxes for ten years.

In the meantime, within the second year of their settlement, this Palatine company was almost destroyed by its Indian neighbors. The native tribes upon the coast, like those further north, had been rapidly dwindling away ever since Sir Walter Raleigh's first attempt to colonize the country, in 1685. One tribe which was then said to be able to bring three thousand warriors into the field, was now reduced to fifteen wretched individuals; another had entirely disappeared, and of others the merest fragments were left. But the Tuscaroras and Corees, dwelling further inland, and holding but little intercourse with the whites, had escaped the contamination of their vices, and the poison of their rum, ever more fatal to the North American Indians, than the fire arms and superior knowledge of their invaders. The two tribes, just mentioned, had, for some time, observed with jealousy and with increasing uneasiness, the growing numbers of the whites, and the steady advance of their settlements into the interior of their country. The intrusion of a surveyor, whom they found engaged upon their territory, with his chain and compass, aroused them to a sense of their danger, and impelled them to seek for the utter extermination of their dangerous neighbors. Graffenried and Lawson, the surveyor, were seized, and the latter put to death, the other making a narrow escape.† By a well concerted plan, they, in one night,

*Williamson's History of N. Carolina, I, pp. 178—186.

†Bancroft, Hist. U. S., III., 320.

cut off one hundred and thirty of the settlers, from the Roanoke, along Pamlico Sound, to the Neuse. According to the usages of Indian warfare, men, women and children were indiscriminately butchered. The savages passed from village to village, and from house to house, with the swiftness, as well as with the ferocity of wolves, and had not a few individuals managed to escape and carry the alarm to the more distant settlements, not a white man would have been left in North Carolina to tell the story of their destruction. The Germans, notwithstanding Graffenried's treaty in their favor, were severe sufferers,* and the progress of their settlements was greatly interrupted, until 1715, when peace was finally concluded with the Corees, the Tuscaroras having, two years previously, emigrated in a body to the North, where they were taken into the confederacy of the Five Nations, of which they now formed the sixth. After the restoration of peace, the industrial and frugal habits of the Germans secured their usual reward of quiet, prosperity and happiness.

But the great mass of German emigration to America was, providentially, directed to the North, although the object for which they were first sent in large bodies to New York, might have been more successfully attained in North Carolina. Naval stores being, just at that period, an object of great importance to the British nation and government, the idea was suggested that the Palatines might be successfully employed in their production, in the manufacture of tar, turpentine and rosin, and the cultivation of hemp in some part of the provinces, favorable to these pursuits. Col. Robert Hunter, who was appointed as Governor of New York and New Jersey, in September, 1709, (Lord Lovelace having died the 6th of March preceding) appears to have suggested this idea to the Lords of the Board of Trade. He proposed to take with him to New York, three thousand of the Palatines, and settle them at points, where it was supposed that the articles, just mentioned, could be most readily raised and manufactured. After some consideration, his plans were adopted by the Board of trade, and recommended to the Government for adoption, in a report, of which we give the following abstract:

The report commences by observing, that the Province of New York being the most advanced frontier of the British colonies on the continent of America, its defence and preservation are of the utmost importance to the security of all the

*Williamson's History of N. Carolina, I, 275—281.

rest. It was then argued, that the settlement of the Palatines, in that Province, would aid in its protection, not only against the French of Canada, but also against the restless Indian tribes. It was also stated that there were, on the Hudson and Mohawk rivers, large bodies of pines, suitable for the production of turpentine and tar and the manufacture of rosin and pitch, and on these rivers, also, there were large bodies of land belonging to the Crown, upon which the Germans might be settled. Here it was proposed that they should be placed, either in one body, or in different settlements, as the Governor might find most desirable, several families being encouraged to unite and work in partnership. It was supposed that one man could produce, in a year, six tons of tar or turpentine, and that, by a proper combination, the quantity per head might be nearly doubled, so that six hundred men might produce seven thousand tons annually. This would amount to twelve tons for each laborer, and as there was a bounty of four pounds sterling, at that time, paid by the British Government, upon every ton of tar imported into the country, this alone would give about $240 for each person employed, so that the Government might anticipate a very large profit from the operation. As only 6d a day was to be paid for the support of each adult, and 4d for each child, allowing a family to average five persons, their maintenance would cost less than $200 a year, and this the bounty alone would more than pay. But besides this, it was thought that the children might be engaged in the manufacture of turpentine and rosin, they could also cultivate their lands and raise hemp, so that there seemed to be no doubt that they could, in the course of a few years, repay the money, expended for their transportation and support. The British Government, also, believed that it would be for the interest of the nation to pay for these articles in their colonies, with their own manufactured goods, rather than to pay ready money for them, when procured in Sweden or Russia, even if the nominal price were somewhat greater in the former than in the latter case.

It was, therefore, determined that a person acquainted with the production of these articles, and a suitable number of assistants should accompany the Palatines to New York, to instruct and superintend them in their work, as well as to select suitable localities for carrying it on. There was also to be an agent in New York to receive the articles manufactured, keep an account of them, and act as disbursing agent

of the funds, devoted to the sustenance of the Palatines, for whom he was also to keep an account, giving each individual the proper credit for all the articles manufactured by him, and also for the bounty allowed by law to all colonial importers of naval stores, there manufactured.

In consideration of the services thus rendered, the Governor of New York was directed to grant, under the seal of that Province, without fee or reward, forty acres of land per head, to each family, to them and their heirs, forever, under the usual quit-rent, which was to commence and be payable after seven years from the date of each respective grant. And, finally, it was proposed that immediately upon the arrival in New York, the Palatines should be naturalized, without fee or reward, that they might enjoy all the privileges and advantages of the inhabitants of that Province.*

Whatever doubts they might have as to the working of this plan, its advantages were too obvious to be lightly rejected by the homeless, houseless and starving Palatines. It offered them immediate support and provision for themselves and families, and the prospect of new homes, happiness, and even landed estates, in what was represented to them as the very paradise of the Western world. Governor Hunter had, therefore, no difficulty in obtaining as many of them as he desired, to go with him to New York, in order to make this experiment. Within a few days after the presentation of this plan, the representatives of three thousand Palatines came forward and signed an article, wherein they engaged to go to the Province of New York, there to settle in such places as might be allotted to them, and to remain there with their families, in such bodies or societies, as should be thought useful or necessary, either for carrying on the manufacture of things, proper for naval stores, or for the defence of themselves and the rest of her Majesty's subjects, against the French, or any other of her Majesty's enemies, and not, upon any account, to quit said Province without first obtaining leave from the Governor for so doing, employing and occupying themselves and families as proposed, and behaving themselves, in all respects, as dutiful subjects of her Majesty, or her representative, the Governor of New York, for the time being.†

During their sojourn in England, this party of Palatines

*Documentary History of N. Y., V, pp. 117—120.

†Ibid. pp. 120—121.

also received the most benevolent attention from the Rev. Mr. Boehme, by whom they were furnished with Bibles and other religious books, the good results of which some of them, many years after their settlement in America, related with tears of gratitude, to Dr. Muhlenberg and other missionaries and pastors, by whom they were visited.* Their bodily wants were, also, most carefully attended to by a committee appointed for the purpose, the collections, taken up for them in the churches and in other ways, amounting, as we have already seen, to very considerable sums.

The fleet (consisting of ten ships) being at length ready, the weary exiles, almost reduced to despair, by their many disappointments and long delays, went aboard their various vessels, at Portsmouth, whence they set sail in the dead of winter, that is to say, on Christmas day, 1709. A long and dreary voyage was before them, and their sufferings from cold, long confinement and want of suitable provisions, must have been exceedingly severe. For six months they were tossed about, by the wintry storms, upon the Atlantic, and it was not until the 12th of June,† 1710, that they reached their port of destination, in New York. Stowed together in the steerage of ships of no great size, some carrying double the number that they ought to have had, with a scant allowance of poor provisions, their sufferings must have been terriffic. But no record, of the incidents of this voyage, has come down to us. Only here and there we have a startling suggestion as to the facts of the case. Thus Gov. Hunter‡ announces to the Board of Trade (July 24th, something over a month after his arrival) that the Herbert Frigate, containing their tents and arms, had been cast away, on the east end of Long Island, the Berkley Castle, left at Portsmouth, had not yet been heard from, "the poor people have been mighty sickly," and "*we have lost above four hundred and seventy of our number.*" Thomas Benson, "Chyrurgeon" (Surgeon) "to the transport-ship, the Lyon of Lieth, whereof Captain Stevens was commander," says§ that there were three hundred and thirty persons on board that ship, "all sick at the same time, with no one but himself to assist them." But

*Hallische Nachrichten.

†When the ship Lyon arrived. See Document. Hist. III, 551. Gov. Hunter came in two days later.

‡O'Callaghan's Document. Hist., III., 554.

§Ibid. p. 556.

John Conrad Weiser, who was himself a sufferer in these trying scenes, says, that the number of emigrants was between three and four thousand, and that out of this number *about seventeen hundred died, either on board their ships, or soon after landing.** This is an awful mortality, rivaling even the the horrors of the middle passage in slave ships.

Upon their arrival in New York, the city authorities stood aghast at the scene which these vessels presented. The officers of the port, who boarded them, thought that they had been suffering from the plague, or "some contagious disease," and so reported to the Mayor, who forthwith convened the Corporation, and presented a petition to the Council, praying that the emigrants might "not be permitted to come within the city." It was, therefore, ordered that they should be landed on Natten (now Governor's) Island, where huts were soon erected for them, and other arrangements made for their accommodation. A committee was also appointed to draw up a scheme for their government, in accordance with which, several of their own number were commissioned as Justices of the Peace, for the preservation of good order among them.

It is difficult to conceive the feelings of the poor emigrants, thus landed upon a foreign shore. It is true, they had at last reached their desired haven, their land of promise in the New World. And in the leafy month of June, everything looked gay and beautiful around them. New York Bay spread out its beautiful panorama; the mighty Hudson poured down its vast tribute of waters to the ocean, which rolled and roared and gleamed in ever-changing beauty, beyond them; and the green forests and blue hills of Long Island, Manhatten and New Jersey shone, like a vision of fairyland, all around them. But most of them were too much broken down by disease and dispirited by suffering, to enjoy, or even to notice these glorious features of the strange land, which they had at length reached. There was scarcely a family that had not lost a husband or a wife, a son or a daughter. If we take Gov. Hunter's statement, they had been more than decimated; but if Mr. Weiser had been properly informed, more than one out of every three had perished! Nearly fifty widows and a hundred orphans, that had lost one or both of their parents, still remained at New

*Document. V, pp. 553—555.

York the winter after their arrival in America.* There was a young widow of three and twenty, left utterly alone—husband and children all gone, and there was an old lady of sixty-seven in the same position,—which the more desolate, it would be difficult to say. Here was a mother with five children, the youngest not yet two years old, and her oldest son but eighteen, and there another with three daughters, the oldest just sixteen. But still more sad was the condition of those left without either father or mother, or any earthly friend, upon whom they could lean for support. There was nearly a score of helpless little ones, the youngest of whom was not yet three, and the oldest nine years of age, and as many more, between that and fifteen. The hearts of the good people of New York, and the surrounding country and villages, melted in compassion at such a sight, and Governor Hunter soon received numerous applications from persons who were willing to take care of them. By the end of the week after their arrival, a plan for apprenticing such children was drawn up and made known through the public newspapers;† and it was subsequently arranged, that the boys should be bound until the age of seventeen, and the girls until fifteen. Dr. Staats and Mr. Van Dam, two highly respectable gentlemen of the City Council, were appointed to superintend the matter, and take indentures, requiring those to whom they were committed, "to cloathe, victual and use them well, and to deliver them to the Government when called for." Under this regulation, about eighty orphans, and half-orphans, were bound or apprenticed, and, it is to be hoped, that they were generally well treated, among the plain but simple-hearted people of the country, who, though not wealthy, had all the necessaries of life in abundance. The course of one of them we are able to trace, and if he could be taken as a representative of the whole class, their lot in life was sufficiently fortunate. John Peter Zenger, the son of Joanna Zenger, a widow with three children, of whom he was the eldest, being at that time thirteen years of age, was apprenticed to William Bradford, long known as the leading printer of New York. Twenty years afterwards this poor boy had become the proprietor and publisher of the "New York Weekly Messenger," one of the most influential news-

*See the list in O'Callaghan's Document. Hist. III, 563—565.

†Document. Hist., III, 553.

papers of the day. It was in the person of this poor Palatine printer, also, that the freedom of the press in America, was first tested and vindicated. The trial of Zenger, for a libel upon the government, is one of the events by which American independence was fore-shadowed and hastened. Governor Cosby, one of the most corrupt and arbitrary agents who represented the government of Britain, in the Province of New York, having first had Zenger's paper burnt by the common hangman, next proceeded to indict him for a libel. The speech of Andrew Hamilton, of Philadelphia, his principal advocate at his trial, is one of the most celebrated in the history of American forensic eloquence. Zenger was triumphantly acquitted by the jury, the city was filled with rejoicing at the result, and the Corporation of New York presented Hamilton with the freedom of the city and their fervent "thanks, for his learned and generous defence of the rights of mankind and the freedom of the press," which had just been put in jeopardy in the person of Peter Zenger, who, some twenty years before, was an object of interest only as a helpless orphan, just able to stammer out a few words of broken English.

But scarcely less helpless than these poor orphans, was a vast body of grown-up men and women, whom cold, hunger, the perils and sufferings of their voyage, anxiety, sorrow and sickness had brought down to the very verge of the grave, and who now stalked about like ghosts, without strength or spirit for any kind of labor. Several hundred such persons were compelled to remain in New York during the whole summer and winter succeeding their arrival, and many of them, no doubt, descended to an untimely grave.

One of the first objects, claiming Gov. Hunter's attention, after his arrival with the Palatines, was to select lands upon which to place them, so that they might successfully carry out the plan proposed for their employment. There is a tradition among the Germans, that whilst they were encamped in the neighborhood of London, a deputation of Mohawk Indians, who had just arrived in England, chanced to see them, and having inquired who they were, were moved to pity by their misfortunes, so that when they were, a short time afterwards presented to the Queen, they told her that if those poor people could be sent over to their country, they would freely give them an abundance of land upon which to settle, and whence they might, with the ordinary skill of the whites, derive a comfortable subsistence. A passage in Gov. Hun-

ter's letter* to the Lords of Trade, dated the 24th of July, 1710, seems to corroborate this idea. He there says: "Soon after my arrival, I sent the surveyor, with some skillful men, to survey the land on the Mohawk River, particularly the Skohare, *to which the Indians had no pretence*, being Col. Bayard's grant."† Captain Weiser asserts, in his petition to the Lords of Trade, (Aug. 2, 1720,) that "the Indians had yielded to her late Majesty, (Queen Anne) of pious memory, a small tract of land, called Schorie (Schoharie) for the use of the Palatines," and in his subsequent memorial‡ (Aug. 20, 1720) declares that the Governor had acknowledged their right to the land. The Governor, who was present in London at the time the first petition was presented, and has left his answer to it on record, in form of marginal notes,§ seems tacitly to admit the correctness of Weiser's statement. But there seems to have been a strong desire on the part of speculators, to get those fine lands, which now form a part of Schoharie county, into their possession, so that Gov. Hunter was, in all probability, assailed by them in reference thereto almost as soon as he arrived in the country. It was also true, as the Governor stated,|| that "these lands were no ways fit for the design in hand, being very good lands which bear no pines," out of which the tar and turpentine were to be made. They were, also, at too great a distance from New York and from navigation, by which alone, transportation could, at that time, be effected to any advantage. It was, therefore, determined to settle them on both sides of the Hudson, about one hundred miles above New York.

*Documents, V, 167.

†A strange assertion, in view of the fact that Bayard's title to this land had been revoked by the British government, on account of alleged fraud in its procurement, said (in the Documents, V, 16), to have been bought of six Indians when drunk, in the absence of the rest of the tribe, and still claimed by the Indians," p. 22.

‡See it in the "Document. Hist." III, pp. 707–714.

§Documents, V, 553–555.

||Ibid. p. 167.

## ARTICLE II.

### JEPHTHAH'S VOW.—JUDGES 11: 30—40.

THE facts connected with this remarkable passage are well known and have always excited a deep interest. Jephthah, as he prepares to lead the children of Israel to battle against their oppressors, on his departure from home, with the prospect of danger before him, in earnest prayer for the Divine presence, formed a solemn vow or made a religious promise to God, that if He would prosper him in his hazardous undertaking, and permit him to return victorious, whatsoever should first come out of his house to meet him should be devoted or offered up as a sacrifice to God. A battle is fought, Jephthah triumphs over his foes, the Ammonites, and a decisive victory crowns the arms of Israel. Tidings of the result having reached his home in advance of his arrival, his daughter, an only child, with timbrels and dances, came out first to meet her father, that she might express her congratulations and bring her tribute of gratitude. The father, in the anguish of his heart, rent his clothes and gave utterance to his sorrow. On receiving an explanation, the daughter cordially acquiesces in his vow, and insists that he should do according to that which had proceeded out of his mouth. She only requests a respite of a few weeks, that she may be permitted to go up and down upon the mountains with her companions and bewail her virginity. At the end of two months, after the days of her mourning had expired, "she returned unto her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed."

Critics are not agreed in their exposition of this passage. Some of the ablest commentators have maintained that the daughter was really put to death by her father, and her body burned as a burnt offering, whilst others suppose that she was only devoted or consigned to a state of perpetual virginity. The argument, in our judgment, is decisive against the sacrifice. We suppose that Jephthah devoted her, in some special way, to the service of the Lord, and that was a life of celibacy, which was, no doubt, regarded as almost equivalent to an immolation. In support of this interpretation we offer the following reasons:

I. The grammatical structure of the passage allows this

explanation. The conjunctive particle, employed in the 31st verse, may be used copulatively or disjunctively. The paucity of connecting particles in the Hebrew language makes it necessary, that the conjunction should sometimes be understood disjunctively, and we accordingly find it often rendered *and*, or *or*, *both*, or *either*. The proper meaning of the word is, therefore, to be ascertained by the discussion with which it stands connected. If we then adopt the disjunctive particle, which is found in the marginal reading, and was first suggested by Kimchi, the vow will read, "Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, or I will offer it up for a burnt offering. Two ideas are then embraced in the vow, first that whatever person met him on his return should be the Lord's, or dedicated to his service; and, secondly, that whatever beast he first encountered, if clean, should be offered up unto the Lord for a burnt offering, in accordance with the regulation in the Levitical code concerning vows.

II. The context itself favors this interpretation. We find nothing in the passage, apart from the language of the vow, which would indicate that the daughter was put to death. All that is stated with regard to the assumed obligation, is that he "did with her according to the vow which he vowed," which means nothing more than that he, in a peculiar manner, devoted her to the Lord. This more satisfactorily explains the context than the hypothesis, that he offered her up as a burnt offering. This also furnishes an adequate reason for the deep distress he manifested at meeting her on his return. The context tells us that she was an only child. Her devotement, in the manner suggested, would result in the utter extirpation of his name and family. This in Israel was regarded as a serious calamity. The Hebrews were very anxious to transmit their name to posterity. The idea of consigning his daughter to perpetual celibacy and seclusion, and of witnessing the extinction of his lineage, excited in his breast the greatest grief. He knew that he could not recall his vow; it had been made under the most solemn circumstances, and no human power could absolve him from its demands. This interpretation also better explains the conduct of the daughter with her companions in passing a brief season, prior to the execution of the vow, in bewailing her virginity. That this should be the occasion of their lamentation, in prospect of the immolation of one of their number,

appears both unnatural and inconsistent. But adopting the exposition proposed, the passage is relieved of the difficulty, and the very course, they would be likely to pursue, is readily suggested. She was about to take her final departure from them, to retire from the scenes in which she had been accustomed to mingle, to spend a life of celibacy, either in seclusion or some such occupation as would separate her from their society and exclude from her mind all hope of rearing a family; therefore "she went with her companions and bewailed her virginity upon the mountains." And the sacred record adds, "It came to pass, at the end of two months, that she returned unto her father, who did with her according to the vow which he had vowed; and she knew no man." On the supposition that at the expiration of two months she was sacrificed as a burnt offering, the latter clause of the verse, just quoted, would seem very unnatural, but with the interpretation given it is altogether reasonable and consistent. The vow of the father was discharged by consecrating her to the Lord, by devoting her exclusively to Him in the service of the tabernacle or some other sacred employment, instead of giving her to some one in marriage, and, by this means, perpetuating his family and extending his influence. "The daughters of Israel," it is said, "went yearly to lament with the daughters of Jephthah, the Gileadite, four days in a year." The word translated to lament, in the original signifies to talk with, or to commune with, and, therefore, implies that Jephthah's daughter was still living. Although she had retired from the world and was engaged in the service of the sanctuary, it seems natural that her former friends should visit her and converse with her, should come, at appropriate seasons, to offer her their condolence and comfort. And the very circumstances which produced her seclusion would excite deep interest and awaken a warm sympathy, especially among those who had formerly been intimately associated with her.

III. Our interpretation of the passage is confirmed by the fact that such devotements were not uncommon in Israel. Jewish parents sometimes dedicated their children, sons and daughters, to the perpetual service of God in the tabernacle or temple. Samuel was thus devoted to the Lord by Hannah, his mother. In the 31st chapter of Numbers, an account is given of a war of the Israelites with the Midianites, and in the division of the spoils, those are mentioned who were to be assigned to the Levites, who kept the charge of the tabernacle of the Lord. We know, that there were many female, as

well as, male servants, employed in the religious services of the sanctuary. In Ezra 11 : 65 allusion is also made to singing women as well as to singing men. Our Saviour's remark, that there are some, who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of God, would seem to imply that such a practice was not only authorized but regarded with favor. From the narrative given in 1 Cor. 7 : 32–34, we may gather the same conclusion. Widows are also referred to, in the sacred record, who remained in their state of widowhood, influenced by a regard to the service of the Lord. Anna, the prophetess, "who departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers, night and day," is an illustration, whilst the company of widows in the primitive Church indicates that the same practice existed at that period in the history of the Church.

IV. The nature of the vow itself, likewise, favors this exposition. Vows were in common practice among the Israelites. They met with the Divine approval, and were regarded as an evidence of piety and gratitude. In the book of Leviticus there is presented a detailed account of the nature and regulation of these extraordinary vows or voluntary devotements. Their objects were various. They related to individuals, beasts, clean and unclean, property in houses and lands, dedicated to the Lord for religious purposes. The law or condition in reference to a human being, was "When a man shall make a singular vow, the persons shall be for the Lord by thy estimation;" then is given a rate of estimation according to the age or sex of the individual. In reference to clean beasts the rule was, "Whereof men bring an offering unto the Lord, all that any man giveth of such unto the Lord, shall be holy;" with such devotement there was no estimation or condition connected. In reference to unclean beasts, they were to be brought before the priest and by him valued. It could then be redeemed by the addition of one-fifth to the value of it. In Jephthah's vow, "Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me," one of these objects of devotement was embraced, either some person belonging to his household, or some brute animal, clean or unclean, included in his property. Now with the adoption of our exposition the solution of the question is simple and natural, altogether consistent with the regulation concerning such vows. One of his household, regarded as improper for a sacrifice, was to be the Lord's, *i. e.*, consecrated to his service. An unclean beast, such as a camel, a horse or dog, which could not be

offered as a burnt sacrifice, was also to be employed in the service of the Lord for carrying burdens in the tabernacle or temple. But a clean beast, such as oxen, sheep, turtle-doves or pigeons, which men were wont to devote to the Lord, was to be considered holy and offered to the priest for a sacrifice. The law, therefore, in its first specification, applied to Jephthah's case. As his daughter, his only child, came to meet him on his return, she was, by this singular vow, necessarily devoted, not to death, but, with her own consent, to perpetual virginity in the service of the Lord.

V. The character of Jephthah is also a vindication of the view presented. Independently of this single act, there is nothing mentioned in the sacred narrative to the disparagement of his piety, or calculated to throw a shadow over his character or to implicate his integrity. It is true, he was an illegitimate child, the victim of rude and violent persecution, and became an exile from his father's house and his native country, in consequence of the unkindness and arrogance of his brethren, yet there is nothing stated, in connection with this transaction, that reflects unfavorably upon his reputation, but every thing, rather, which would lead us to suppose that he was an individual of distinction and influence. The record does say, that certain vain fellows joined themselves to him in his banishment, *i. e.*, idle, adventurous persons followed him, who were disposed to repose confidence in his abilities as a leader in making predatory excursions into the neighboring countries, a mode of life never in the East considered dishonorable, unless the expedition was against a man's own tribe or nation. The same fact is mentioned concerning David, under similar circumstances, when driven from the court of Saul. And it may be that, like David, he furnished his followers with religious instruction, corrected their aberrations and proved to them a blessing. We know, too, that his own brethren, in their hour of necessity and peril, recalled him from his exile and submitted to him as their military general, which, it is not probable, they would have done if he had been unworthy of regard, or his character in any way tarnished. He was certainly a pious man when he made the vow, for it is said in immediate connection, that the Spirit of God came upon him, and it cannot be supposed that an individual under the influence of the Spirit, could deliberately vow to God, that he would commit murder. The calmness, wisdom, and forethought which he usually displayed, is convincing proof that he would not be guilty of so

wicked rashness. Besides the Apostle Paul, in his trophies of faith, ranks him among the crowd of faithful witnesses, which he would scarcely have done, if an act so contrary to the Divine law, as that of shedding innocent blood, had been perpetrated. We have every reason to believe that Jephthah was a man of intelligent, practical piety. He made a vow perfectly consistent with the character of the dispensation under which he lived, and for the discharge of which there were regulations existing to meet every circumstance that could occur. This vow he faithfully fulfilled, at a great personal inconvenience and domestic sacrifice.

VI. The immolation of his daughter would have been unlawful. In order that a vow be acceptable to God, it is necessary that it have regard to objects that are in themselves lawful. When lawful and practicable it should be regularly kept, but whatever is forbidden by the Divine law cannot, by being made the subject of a vow, be justified. So that he who has vowed to do that which cannot be done without the commission of sin, is so far from being under obligation to perform his vow that he is, notwithstanding his vow, under obligation not to discharge it—the original wrong of making such a vow being greatly aggravated by its observance. His duty would be to repent for having so criminal an intention. On the supposition that he had made a rash vow, God would never have sanctioned his conduct. He would have released him from so gross an offence as the murder of his own daughter. Nothing is clearer than that the sacrifice of human victims was an abomination in the sight of God, and that he had repeatedly interdicted them with the strongest expressions of detestation. The offering of children to Moloch was held in great abhorrence, and was prohibited by an express law, under the penalty of death, as a defilement of God's sanctuary and a profanation of his holy name: Lev. 20 : 2, 3. Besides no father had the authority to devote to death even an offending child, much less one that was innocent, without the sentence of the magistrate and the consent of the people: Deut. 21 : 18–21. There was also a tradition among the Jews that if such a devotement were made, it became null and void, because no man can devote what is not his own, or of whose life he has not the absolute control. Again no one would have been found to execute the work. No high priest would have done it. The father himself could not have done it, for this would have been in direct violation of the Levitical code,

which required that every offering should be made by the hand of the priest and at the place where the altar and tabernacle stood.

VII. Divine Providence, it is not probable, would have permitted such a result, as the sacrifice of an innocent, unoffending daughter. Supposing, that the vow was improperly made and Jephthah contemplated a human victim as an offering, God would, no doubt, have interposed and prevented its execution. There was on the occasion a most solemn appeal to Heaven to maintain, by the issue of events, the cause of justice and right. Would God have allowed his own servant, although he had erred, to be involved in so offensive an act without rescuing him from his perilous position? In the case of Abraham in the proposed offering of his son Isaac, God meant merely to try the faith of the patriarch, and, at the proper time, brought a way of deliverance. So in the present instance, we believe so good a man would, in the Providence of God, have been delivered from the perpetration of a deed, with which so much cruelty and wrong were connected.

These considerations appear conclusive against the immolation, but as decidedly sustaining the theory, that Jephthah, instead of offering his daughter as a sacrifice, devoted her in some special way, to the service of the Lord and, with her full acquiescence, to a life of celibacy. The sense of the vow, undoubtedly is, "Whatsoever cometh out of the door of my house, I will, if it be a thing proper for a burnt offering, make it one, or, if not, I will consecrate it to the service of the Lord." An alternative is thus presented, which, by every other method of interpreting the passage, is entirely precluded.

---

## ARTICLE III.

### M. MINUCII FELICIS OCTAVIUS.

PARISIIS, GAUTHIER, FRATER ET SOC., 1836.

BY H. W. THORPE, A. M., Davidsonville, Md.

To make himself intimately acquainted with the history of the period immediately preceding that in which his own

lot is cast, is the duty of every intelligent man, whose position in life gives him any influence over the course of events, either in Church or State. In a free country, this knowledge is alike necessary to magistrate and people; without it, a Legislator is a mere empiric, and the citizen, exercising his franchise, is like a gladiator in the dark. This portion of history is, therefore, in such a country as ours, of superlative interest and importance; but apart from this, no period more deserves our attention than the first three centuries of the Christian era, comprehending the great struggle to establish our pure faith on the ruins of the Polytheism and superstitions of the ancient world.

The Christian religion, moreover, did not, like most others, spring up in a time of mental darkness; nor spread first over barbarous regions or among ignorant men. True, as its Divine founder declared, it was peculiarly, the Gospel preached to the poor; true, its first Apostles were unlearned and ignorant men; true, it proclaimed deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; and these expressions, though partially figurative, comprehending, among prisoners and captives, many who would most loudly boast their own liberty, are not altogether a metaphor. Our holy religion was most eagerly embraced by those classes on whom suffering pressed most heavily; yet among its supporters and defenders, we find enrolled some of the brightest names of those eventful centuries. And it was promulgated at a time of great intellectual refinement. The brilliant Augustine age had just passed away, and if the giants of those days had left no equals behind them, they most certainly had left a more widely spread intelligence, and greater literary emulation; the mountain-waves had subsided, but the waters all around were elevated even by their depression.

And of this cultivation, we find that Africa had her full share and furnished her full proportion of the great champions of the Church. How much soever she has in later eras been debased, in those early times her mental life was vigorous, her schools of rhetoric held the very first rank, and, to say nothing of her Bishops and clergy, to her the Church owes the three lay standard bearers of the cross, the Latin lay Fathers as they have been not inaptly called, Minucius Felix, Arnobius and Lactantius. Their works, at one time so deservedly popular, are now but little known; and we have thought a brief notice of them would not be devoid of interest to the readers of the Review. We firmly believe that

portions of their works might be read in our Colleges with advantage; their style is unimpeachable, and periodical recitations of sacred Latin would be a powerful auxiliary in Christian instruction. At this time we shall confine our remarks to the earliest of the three, Marcus Minucius Felix. Born and educated in Africa, he afterwards removed to Rome, and was there a busy Advocate, in the reign of the Emperor Severus, about A. D. 194.

If Lactantius has a few passages which a Council of Divines would pronounce heretical, even these passages, the fruit of a vigorous imagination, and early familiarity with the heathen literature, are not without their interest; and his brilliant conceptions, couched in language so pure, in sentences so elegant, that he was styled the Christian Cicero, have for us an indescribable charm. Moreover, if Arnobius, with his vigorous denunciations of heathen abominations, is sometimes led into a too detailed reference to things which must have been commonly known in his own days, but which for us had better remain covered by the veil of antiquity, and would render the excision of a few sentences necessary in an edition for the study of our youth, the Octavius of Minucius Felix is a delightful little treatise, almost entirely free from both defects, and in a style so simple that the young Christian scholar will always read it with pleasure.

This work, the only undisputed production of its author's pen remaining to us, is a controversial dialogue between two philosophers, a heathen and a Christian, in which the heathen, after very eloquently bringing forward all the arguments and charges against Christianity that he can find, is, at length, convinced of his error and converted to the faith, by the reasonings of his opponent. There is about the dialogue an air of reality, which strongly impresses the reader; but whether Minucius aims to give the exact language of the disputants, or merely the substance of their arguments in his own words, cannot be determined. From the uniformity of style we incline to the belief that the latter hypothesis is the correct one.

The treatise opens with a sweetly mournful reminiscence of the author's deceased friend, Octavius; and passing in rapid review the many happy years spent in his society, when their studies and pleasures were associated, so that one mind was, as it were, shared between the two; when they took sweet counsel together and walked together to the house of God; making especial mention of the fact, that they were both at

the same time converted to the religion of Jesus Christ, the writer's thoughts at length rest with peculiar complacency on the incident which forms the subject of the tract.

Minucius, as was said, had quitted his African home and engaged in the practice of an Advocate in the Capital of the Empire; where, after a long interval he was visited by Octavius, also grown to man's estate, and the father of a family. The first few days were spent at Rome, in friendly conversation and mutual inquiries; when, as the Courts had adjourned for the vintage vacation, the two friends resolved to enjoy the sea-bathing at Ostia, as well for the renovation of health after long confinement to the city, as agreeable recreation. Walking together at day-break, along the beach, charmed alike by the gentle breeze and by pressing with their feet the yielding sand, they meet with a mutual friend and fellow countryman, named Cœcilius, who, less happy than his associates, is still in heathen darkness, as is evidenced by his kissing his hand as they are passing a statue of Serapis. This passage will at once remind the reader of Holy Scripture of the disclaimer of the patriarch Job, (chap. xxxi. v. 26, 27,) "If I beheld the Sun when it shined, or the Moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand," and of the seven thousand faithful in Israel, whose mouth had not kissed Baal: and it receives further illustration from the remarkable Graffito recently discovered in the palace of the Cæsars' to which reference will be made hereafter. Two centuries earlier, when one Augur could hardly look upon another without laughing, a young Patrician would, probably, have looked on the statue of a foreign divinity, at best, with silent contempt; but by this time, regard for a falling faith had aroused its remaining votaries to greater zeal.

But zeal was not confined to the upholders of the worship of Serapis. The Christian Octavius, fresh from the province, unaccustomed we may suppose, to the polite non-interference of the great city, had marked the gesture, and instantly administered a reproof to Minucius for allowing his friend to remain under the sentence of eternal death. "It is not the part of a good man, brother Marcus," said he, "thus to leave your intimate friend in the blindness of vulgar ignorance, and suffer him in broad day to stumble over stones, even if they are sculptured, and anointed and crowned with garlands. Are you not aware that the reproach of this ignorance falls on you as much as on him?"

By this time the friends had reached the open sea, distant from Ostia, about three miles. Continuing their walk slowly along the beach, the gently-curling waves flowing over their feet, Octavius narrates the incidents of his late voyage; and when they had proceeded as far as they desired, they returned along the same path. Having reached the place, where the small vessels were drawn out of the water and raised above the ground on oaken frames, they observe a group of boys playing Duck and Drake. Minucius and Octavius amuse themselves by watching the game, and the writer gives an interesting description of the mode of playing it; but Cœcilius, standing apart, seems absorbed in thought; and, being asked the reason of his abstraction, replies that he was grieved at the recent remark of Octavius when, rebuking Minucius for negligence, he had charged himself with ignorance; and challenges Octavius to argue the question with him, observing that he would find it a much easier task to discourse with his fellow believers, than to dispute in regular form as in the schools of philosophy. The challenge is accepted; the three friends seat themselves on the rocks by the sea shore, Minucius, as umpire in the middle, and Cœcilius at once enters on his discourse. It is not our purpose, at this time, to give more than a brief outline of the discussion; at a future period the writer may offer to the public a full translation, or perhaps an American edition of the whole treatise.

After a brief exhortation to the Umpire not to be influenced in his decision by his present belief, which he had already manifested by having become a Christian, but to decide strictly in accordance with the arguments which should be advanced on either side, he proceeds to declare that Truth is beyond the reach of mankind, that all things around us are doubtful and uncertain, that probability is the utmost we can attain, and that, therefore, it is little to be wondered at that some men, weary of the useless search, should be ready to yield assent to any theory whatever, rather than perseveringly to continue the investigation. But that it is not to be endured that unlearned and ignorant men should dare to dogmatize on those sublime questions which have vainly exercised the greatest philosophers for so many ages. Supposing that all things around are the work of chance, and produced by the fortuitous concourse of atoms without any superintending intelligence, he goes on to argue, that man and all living things are generated by what he calls a voluntary concretion of the elements, and, at death, are resolved into the elements from

which they sprang; that we find no distinction made between the righteous and the wicked; that both alike suffer from the lightnings of heaven, or conflagrations and pestilence on the earth; that in battle the good fall while cowards escape; and that, even in peace, the wicked seem to be more prosperous than others; that if there were a Divine Providence we should never see a Phalaris and a Dionysius on the throne, a Rutilius or a Camillus in exile, or a Socrates drinking the juice of hemlock. Hence, as we can have no certainty of the superintendence of Providence, it is much better for us to worship those divinities whom we were taught by our parents to reverence, and to have reliance on our ancestors who, in the better ages of the world were more deserving of the favor of the gods. Over all the empire, different countries, provinces and towns worship divinities of their own. The Eleusinians worship Ceres; the Phrygians, Cybele; the Epidaurians Æsculapius; the Chaldees, Bel; the Syrians, Astarte; the people of Tauris, Diana, the Gauls, Mercury; the Romans, all. For this reason the Roman power has extended over all the earth; for this reason their dominion has spread beyond the path of the Sun and the limits of the ocean itself. They even make war with the ceremonies of religion and protect the city by sacred rites, vestal virgins and great honors to priests of many names. When the city was besieged, and all but the Capitolium in the enemy's power, they still made offerings to the offended gods, walking unarmed through the ranks of the astonished Gauls; and whenever they themselves took a hostile city, even in the fury of victory they reverenced the conquered divinities of the place, inviting and adopting all, and building altars even to unknown gods. Witness Cybele, who at her coming both proved the matron's innocence and delivered the city from the fear of the enemy. Witness the consecrated statues of the Equestrian Brothers, who, their horses covered with foam, brought intelligence of the victory over Perseus the very day they had been the means of gaining it. Witness the games of Jupiter, renewed on account of the dream of a Plebeian; the devotion of the Decii; the self-sacrifice of Curtius. Oftener also than we could have wished, the disregarded auspices have witnessed to the presence of the gods. Hence the unlucky day of Allia; hence the overthrow of Claudius and Junius by the Carthaginians. Thrasymene was swollen and discolored with Roman blood, because Flaminius scorned the auguries; and we had to recover our standard from the Parthians because

Crassus both deserved and disregarded the invocation of the Furies. The temples and shrines of the gods, which at once adorn and protect the city, are more regarded because of the divinities abiding in them, than from the abundance of their riches or the magnificence of their sacred rites. Thence, also, the Soothsayers, filled and united with the deity, gather knowledge of futurity, give cautions against danger, healing to the sick, hope to the afflicted, consolation to the wretched, help to the unfortunate, rest to the weary. As to the existence of the gods, all nations are agreed, whatever variety of characters or of origin they may ascribe to them; and I cannot endure the arrogance of men who aim to overthrow this ancient and wholesome belief.

Cœcilius proceeds to bring forward the vulgar accusations against the Christians: that they are the dregs of the populace, a mingled community of abandoned men and women, given up to the most unrestrained, promiscuous lusts, which from calling each other brothers and sisters really become incestuous; that they offer worship to the head of an ass, and even viler things than this, and that, by their adoration of a crucified malefactor, they show their consciousness of the punishment they merit. Much learning has been expended in the explanation of the second of these charges, which was indeed but the revival of an old calumny of the heathen against the Jews. But whatever may have been its origin it has lately received an unexpected elucidation from the recent remarkable discovery in the city of Rome, to which reference has already been made. Father Raphael Garucci, a learned Jesuit, had been for some time engaged in copying and interpreting the Graffito, (scribbling on the walls) at Pompeii, when he was informed that a similar inscription, in Greek characters, had been observed in the substructure of the palace of the Cæsars at Rome, recently excavated. He accordingly proceeded thither and found the Graffito on the side of a room, now subterranean, which appeared to have been walled up to form a foundation for a portion of the palace which it was desired to build on a higher level. The Greek characters proved to be an explanatory legend under a Pagan blasphemous caricature of our Lord's crucifixion, representing a man with uplifted outstretched arm, in the act of kissing the hand toward a human figure with the head of an ass suspended on a cross. The legend reads Αλεξαμενος σεβετε (σεβεται) Θεον Alexamenos worships God.

Cœcilius, moreover, goes on to assert that new converts to

Christianity are initiated with the murder of an infant. That a dagger is put into the Neophyte's hand, with which he is directed to stab into what seems to him a lump of dough, but which in reality covers a living child, and all present eagerly drink up the flowing blood, and devour the body torn limb from limb. He declares that the very secrecy of the rites is an evidence of the truth of the charges, since all things, good and honorable, seek the light, and crime alone loves darkness, and demands why Christians alone have neither altar, image nor temple; why they alone never assemble openly and in public. It is amazing to find Cœcilius putting such a question, when we recollect the savage persecution that attended a public profession of Christianity; that the Church had already been exposed to four general persecutions, and that the fifth raged under Severus, in whose reign must be placed the residence of Minucius at Rome; so that it is not improbable that at the very time this taunting question was asked, the Christians were hunted up, dragged before unjust tribunals, and compelled to abjure their faith under penalty of torture and death. And it will be observed, that he does not pretend to adduce any proof of the enormities he charges upon the believers: his reasoning is, their assemblies must be wicked because they are held in secret. And who, he continues, or where, or whence is that single, solitary, melancholy God, whom no free nation, no kingdom, not even the all-comprehending superstition of Rome acknowledges? The contemptible tribe of the Jews alone, have one only God, but even they worship openly, in temples, with altars, victims and ceremonies. And so powerless is this their deity, that he is the captive of the Romans, with the whole nation that respects him. But the Christians, what monstrous prodigy of a God have they invented! They neither can show Him to others nor pretend to see him themselves, yet He strictly scrutinizes the life and acts of all, nay even their words and thoughts. They imagine Him hastening in every direction and everywhere present; troublesome, restless, indiscreetly inquisitive: overseeing all actions and wandering through all places. But spread over the whole, He could not watch the individual, nor busied about individuals, could He suffice for the whole.

And what are we to say when they foretell conflagration and ruin to the whole earth and to the heaven with all its stars? As if the eternal order, established by the divine

laws of nature, can ever be destroyed, or the concord of the elements broken, the structure of the heavens dissolved, and the whole universe overwhelmed in ruin. And, with madness still greater, they invent silly fables, of a resurrection of the dead; that the ashes of the funeral pyre shall be restored to life; and, with inconceivable assurance, they persuade each other to believe these monstrous falsehoods; they speak with such confidence that you might suppose they had already risen. With two-fold madness, they proclaim destruction to the sky and the stars, which we leave at death as we found them at our birth, yet promise eternity to themselves, who both are born and die. For this reason they condemn the funeral pyre and oppose the burning of the dead, as if the body, though it escape the flames, will not in time be entirely decomposed. It matters not whether it be torn by wild beasts, drowned in the sea, buried in the earth or consumed in the flames; for any kind of destruction must be painful if felt; and if unfelt, it is wholesome in proportion to its quickness. Led away by this error they predict for themselves, as being good, a happy and unending life, but to all others, as wicked, everlasting torments.

Cœcilius proceeds to inquire with what body they are to rise: their own will have been utterly dissolved; but if they rise with another, it will be rather a new creation than a resurrection—now, he exclaims, through innumerable ages since the world began, is there a single instance of a return from death, even like the fabled Protesilaus, for a few hours' converse, that we might believe from the example? You, credulous Christians, have adopted as truths, all the playful figments of the poets, and you apply them to your God. You take no warning from the past. The present raises in your minds no apprehension that your vain wishes may possibly deceive you. Misguided men, judge what awaits you after death from your experience of the present life. The most of you, and as you say the best, are in poverty and affliction, contending with hunger and hard labor and want; and your God permits it and is silent. He either will not, or cannot, help his votaries; he is, therefore, either weak or unjust. You, who are dreaming of a posthumous immortality, when you are terrified by some danger, when you are parched by a fever, when you are racked with pain, are you yet insensible of your condition? Do you not yet discover your weakness? Unhappy men! you are fully convinced of your weakness but you will not confess it.

These evils, you may say, are common to all; but you have to endure threats, punishments, tortures. The cross is not only the object of your adoration, it is, moreover, the instrument of your torment. You threaten fire to others, and suffer it yourselves. Where is your God who can restore the dead but cannot aid the living? Do not the Romans, without assistance from your God, possess and enjoy the whole world? Do they not rule over you? You, meanwhile, in doubt and anxiety, abstain even from legitimate pleasures; you do not visit the Theatres, you take no part in public ceremonies, you abhor sacrifices and libations. You use neither garlands nor perfumes. Pale and trembling, moving the pity even of the gods you deny, you will never rise to a future life, and you do not live in the present. If there is either wisdom or modesty left among you, cease to contemplate the heavens and to inquire into the secrets of futurity. It is enough for such rude and ignorant men as you, to attend to what immediately concerns yourselves. You are not qualified to understand the politics of the State; much less are you fitted to discuss things that concern the gods. But if you will philosophize, imitate Socrates, the wisest of men; who, when interrogated about celestial things, replied that we have no concern with things so far above us. He was proclaimed by the oracle to be the wisest, not because he knew more than other men, but because he had discovered that he really knew nothing. The hesitation of Simonides, the Melian, also, is worthy of your attention. Being asked by King Hiero his idea of God, required, at first, a single day to consider the subject; then two days, then three, constantly extending the time already granted, and when the astonished King inquired the reason of the delay, his memorable answer was, that the more he thought about the matter the more obscure it became.

We have now gone through the whole argument of Cœcilius, not pretending to give a literal or full translation, yet omitting nothing of the least weight; and it is a satisfaction to observe that the line of attack is so entirely different from that adopted by the infidel of modern times. He brings, we may say with Festus, none accusation of such things as we supposed; and he acknowledges, tacitly at least, nearly all we claim of the early condition of the Christian Church. We see from the statements of Cœcilius, that so far as this world was concerned, Christians were, of all men, most miserable. The grave charge of incestuous assemblies, and bloody initiations, does not, as we remarked before, pretend to rest

on a tittle of evidence, but simply on confessed ignorance because Christians held their meetings, and performed their worship in secret. But he should have remembered that this secrecy was not of choice, but compulsory; because their assembling in open day was proscribed and persecuted. Nor can we consent, with Gibbon, to transfer the charge of gross immorality, from the main body of orthodox Christians, to the Marcionites or others of the Gnostic heretics. Against these there is not a particle more of evidence than against the others; and the Christian Apologists, to whom Gibbon refers, by no means admit the impeachment, but expressly declare their disbelief of it; at the same time remarking, that even were such wickedness proved against heretical sects, it ought to be no reproach to the Christian community at large.

When Cœcilius had concluded his harangue, he was gently reproved by the Umpire for the tone of haughty contempt he had permitted himself more than once to employ, and after a brief dialogue, containing nothing of moment, but giving the reader a grateful relief from the weightier discourse of the disputants, Octavius commences his reply.

After some introductory remarks on the various and inconsistent positions of his opponent, in turn arguing as an Epicurean, an Academic and a devout believer in the ancient Polytheism; inconsistencies which scarcely leave him firm ground for his reply, he does not attribute them to craft or subtlety in his friend, but to the doubts and uncertainties of his own mind; likening him to a bewildered traveler, where several roads meet, unable to determine which he should select. And since, he continues, my brother declares that he is vexed, angry, outraged and indignant, that poor, unlearned and ignorant men should dare to argue about heavenly things; he should know that all mankind, without distinction of age, sex or rank, are created capable of understanding and reasoning; that these powers are not the gift of fortune, but are implanted by nature. Even philosophers, before they attained renown, were called unlearned and half-naked Plebeians. Rich men, weighed down by their wealth, look rather at their gold than at the heavens, whilst the poor Christians have sought wisdom for themselves and communicated it to others. No one should be reproached for publishing his discoveries in things Divine, and the truth of the doctrine should be more considered than the reputation of the teacher. And indeed the simpler the discourse, the more

valuable it is; not being colored by pomp of eloquence, or grace of diction, but resting on its foundation of right. Nor do I controvert the assertion of Cœcilius, that it is the duty of a man to know himself; to inquire what and whence he is, and wherefore he exists; whether by concretion of the elements, or conglomeration of atoms, or whether he is not rather made, fashioned and animated by God. But this knowledge is not to be reached without an inquiry into the universe itself, since all things so cohere and intertwine that humanity cannot be known without diligently seeking the divine, nor can the government of a single State be properly conducted without an acquaintance with the world, the common city of mankind. While the beasts are prone, looking downwards, to the earth, to us it has been given to look upwards to the heavens, and to discover God by converse and reasoning; we should not, therefore, close our eyes and our senses against the celestial light. Those, who deny that the world was framed by Divine wisdom, and believe that it has resulted from a fortuitous concourse of particles, seem to me to want both intelligence and perception. For whether we lift up our eyes to the heavens, or examine what is round about us and under our feet, what can be so manifest as that there is a Divine mind, by which all nature is inspired, moved, supported and governed? Look at the sky, how far it spreads, how swiftly it rolls, decked at night with the stars, all day enlightened by the sun, and you will perceive with what marvellous wisdom it has been balanced. Observe how the course of the sun makes the year, and the waxing and waning of the moon, the month. What shall we say of the alternation of light and darkness, giving us time both for labor and rest? What must be the wisdom that created all these, when they cannot be so much as comprehended without the highest efforts of our reason! Does not the unvarying recurrence of the seasons bear witness to their Author and Parent? Spring, with its flowers, and summer, with its harvests; the grateful maturity of autumn, and the indispensable olive gathering of winter. With how much wisdom has it been ordered that we are not constantly surrounded with wintry ice or parched with summer heat, but that the year should gently glide through the genial temperature of spring and autumn!

Octavius continues to multiply instances of manifest design and intelligence, concluding that if we should observe, in a house we had chanced to enter, everything elegant and

all well arranged, we should certainly conclude that the master of the house was much better than the furniture; so in this mansion of the universe, looking at the heavens and the earth, their arrangement, order and regularity, we assuredly ought to be persuaded that it has a Lord, fairer than any portion either of earth or sky.

But perhaps you will say that we are agreed as to the wisdom of Providence, and that the only question is, whether the world is under the administration of one or of many. Of this there should be little doubt to any one who will observe the condition of earthly kingdoms. When did ever joint supremacy begin in good faith, or end without bloodshed? To say nothing of the antiquated stories of the Persians, selecting a king by the neighing of a horse, or of the bloody contest of the Theban Brothers, we may well remember the strife of the Twins for the kingdom over shepherds' huts. The war of Father-in-law against Son-in-law is celebrated over all the world, when even the whole Roman Empire could not support two rulers. The hive has one king, (queen) the flock one leader, the herd one ruler; and do you imagine that the supremacy of heaven is divided? It is manifest that God, the Father of all, has neither beginning nor end. He, who gives life to all, is Himself eternal. He existed before the world; is a world to Himself, orders all things by His word, directs and governs all things by His wisdom. Too bright for mortal vision, He is imperceptible by any sense of ours, past all human comprehension, immeasurable, infinite, known as He really is, to Himself alone, and our narrow minds judge of Him aright only when we pronounce Him incomprehensible.

Nor should we seek a name for God. His name is God. He needs no other. If you call Him Father, you speak of Him as earthly; if King, as carnal; if Lord, as mortal. Lay aside all added titles, and you will better perceive His brightness. And here we find a common agreement of all mankind. When men raise their hands to heaven, we hear them exclaim God is great! or, God is true! or, if God please! Is this, then, the natural speech of men, or is it peculiar to the Christian? So also the poets celebrate one Father of gods and men. Homer says:

> For such the minds of men upon the earth,
> As is the day, the Sire of men and gods bestows.

And Virgil with greater distinctness:

> Know first that heaven, and earth's compacted frame,
> And flowing waters and the starry flame,
> And both the radiant lights, one common soul
> Inspires and feeds and animates the whole.

And again, in another place:

> For God goes forth and spreads throughout the whole,
> Heaven, earth and sea, the universal soul:
> Each, at its birth, from Him all beings share,
> Both man and brute, the breath of vital air.

And what other is God declared by us to be, than Mind, Reason and Spirit?

Let us look at the precepts of the Philosophers and we shall find them, amidst great variety of expression, agreeing in reality in this one sentiment. To go no farther back than Thales, the Milesian, who believes the universe originated from water; he declares that God is the mind that formed all things from the water. Then Anaximenes and Diogenes, of Appollonia, say that the air is God, as without bounds or measure. Anaxagoras, too, describes God as the movement of the Infinite Mind; and Pythagoras declares God the soul that permeates the universe. Xenophanes says that God is Mind in boundless space; and in this way the speaker proceeds, through the chief philosophers, tracing in each the idea of one God and Father of all; concluding with the remark that it might be supposed either that the Christians were philosophers, or that the philosophers of old were Christians; and that, consequently no one ought to believe the old fabulous Theogony, since it is clearly rejected by the heathen philosophers themselves. For our ancestors, he continues, so readily gave credence to the greatest absurdities, that they did not hesitate to accept, as truths, the most monstrous prodigies. The multiplex Scylla, the manifold Chimæra, Hydra growing from its propitious wounds, Centaurs, compounded of horse and man, whatever the wildest imagination could conceive, found in them unquestioning believers. Men changed into birds and beasts, into trees and flowers! With the same easy credulity, they converted their deceased monarchs into gods, and imagined them still living in the statues erected to their honor. In old times, before commerce had laid open the world, isolated tribes made themselves gods of their several founders, of popular leaders, of those who introduced among them useful arts and inven-

tions. These things are clearly set forth in the writings of the Stoics and other learned men. Euhemerus, writing of the gods, records their parentage, their native countries, and the places of their sepulture. Jupiter, he says, was born in Crete, Apollo, at Delphi; Isis, in Pharos, and Ceres at Eleusis. Prodicus declares that whoever disseminated among men the knowledge of any useful fruit or plant, was exalted into a divinity.

Alexander the Great, in a letter to his mother, tells her that the Egyptian high-priest, who, according to St. Augustine, was named Leo, and by his authority, had revealed to him the secret of the origin of the gods: that Vulcan was the first of all, and after him the race of Jupiter; that the twittering Sistrum of Isis was suggested by ears of corn, and that the tomb of Serapis, or Osiris, was empty of his scattered limbs.

It is proper to remark, that few modern critics allow the authenticity of this celebrated letter, though probably no one doubted it in the time of Minucius; and Octavius might, therefore, very well quote it in this controversy. It was the common practice of the Christian apologists in their disputes with the Pagans, to maintain that the heathen gods were only deified men, long since dead. And indeed it is of little moment to us to inquire, whether Alexander ever wrote such a letter, or, if he did, whether what we now have is a true copy of it. Over the Homeric Pantheon, Christianity was long ago victorious, and in these latter days we have far other opponents to contend with, very different arguments to employ. Yet, although the battle ground has shifted, and the mode of attack has changed, it is interesting to look back occasionally and trace the victorious progress of our predecessors in the contest.

Octavius proceeds: Consider the sacred mysteries themselves; in them you find represented the misfortunes, calamities and death; the mournings and lamentations of the unhappy gods. Isis, with her Cynocephalus (Dog-headed) and her shaven priests, bewails and searches for her lost son. The sorrowing priests beat their breasts and imitate the wailing of the bereaved mother. Presently the child is found, Isis rejoices, the priests exult, and Cynocephalus, who has discovered him, is glorified. And, year after year, they fail not to lose what they have found, and to find over again what they continue to lose. Is it not alike ridiculous to weep for what you worship, or to worship what you weep

STATE LIBRARY SAN FRANCISCO



for? Yet these superstitions, once confined to Egypt, are now established in Rome. At Eleusis, Ceres, anxious and grieving, with flaming torches and girdled with a serpent, traces her ravished daughter to Pluto's dreary realm.

And what are the mysteries of Jupiter? His nurse is a goat, the infant is carefully concealed from his father who would have devoured him; and the Corybantes keep up a constant clangor with their cymbals, lest the father should over-hear his infant cries. The mysteries of Cybele, and the mutilations of her priests, I should blush to narrate. Octavius passes from the mysteries to direct his wit against the conventional shapes of the heathen divinities. One is lame, another beardless, a third has the feet of a goat, a fourth the horns of a ram. Among these prodigies of form, he mentions one which arrests the attention of the reader of Scripture, and sets before his mental eye the theatre at Ephesus, and the frantic shouting of the infuriated multitude, Great is Diana of the Ephesians! We have it on the authority of Minucius, that the Ephesian Diana, the image that fell down from Jupiter, had many breasts! a statue of a Greek divinity thus rivalling in deformity a Hindoo idol! surely a marvellous inconsistency in the representation of a virgin goddess, whose offended modesty could be appeased by nothing less than the death of the involuntary intruder, and the very icicles of whose temple are emblems of chastity.

Octavius argues that a god cannot spring from a dead man; for a god can never die; nor from any one who was ever born, for all that is born must die; whilst the divinity has neither beginning nor end. And why, he asks, if gods were ever born, are they not still brought forth? Unless it be, he suggests, with his usual keen sense of the ridiculous, that Jupiter has grown old, and Juno past child-bearing; adding, however, that had their generation continued, since they never die, we should, by this time, have more gods than men, and neither heaven nor earth would be large enough to contain them.

And, he adds, if we consider with what tools and instruments an idol is made, we shall surely blush to worship the creature of the workman's hands. For the wooden god has been formed, it may be, of an old post, or of the remnant of a funeral pyre, hung up, cut, hewn and planed. And a brazen, or a silver god, has, not unfrequently, been made of an unclean vessel, melted, beaten with hammers and fashioned

on the anvil. A god of stone has been hewn, chiselled and polished by workmen covered with dust, yet it is insensible alike to the degradation of its origin and to your adoration. But you will say, this metal or wood or stone is not yet a god. When does it become one? Lo! it is cast, it is wrought, it is carved, but it is not yet a god! It is soldered, fitted together and set up, but it is not yet a god! It is adorned, consecrated, prayed to, and now it is a god, since a man has willed it to be so, and has dedicated it!

How do the dumb animals regard your gods? Rats, swallows and kites well know there is no feeling in them; they knaw them, they settle and roost upon them; and if you do not drive them off, will build their nests in the very mouth of your god. Spiders spin their webs over his face, and suspend their threads from his head; you wipe and clean and scrape your god; and the work of your own hands you both protect and fear.

Octavius proceeds to enumerate some of the inconsistencies and impurities of the popular religion, and, supposing the answer made to him, that this superstition had made the Roman Empire what it was, since the people had been no less distinguished for religion and piety, than for valor, he refers his imaginary interlocutor to the origin of the nation. Were not the people, he asks, at the very first collected by crime, and defended by the general dread of their ferocity? They came to the offered asylum: the ruined, the criminal, the incestuous; murderers and traitors flocked thither: and Romulus himself, their ruler and governor, that he might have precedence even in wickedness, killed his own brother. Such was the beginning of this religious nation, to be speedily followed by the unprecedented rape of the women of a neighboring State; some betrothed and some already married. Rome, he declares, grew great by her iniquitous conquests; and the gods, she worshipped, were the gods of the vanquished tribes. And what could divinities, who had been unable to defend their own votaries, benefit the Romans? The indigenous gods of Rome, he says, were Romulus, Picus, Tiberinus and Consus, and Pilumnus and Volumnus. Tatius introduced the worship of Cloacina; Hostilius, of Pavor and Pallor; and very soon, I know not by whom, a temple was dedicated to Fever! The objects of worship were infirmities and diseases; and even the harlots, Acca Laurentia and Flora, are to be reckoned among the Roman deities.

I come now to those auspices and auguries, the disregard of which, you state, has proved so fatal. Clodius, it seems,

and Flaminius, and Junius, lost their armies because they did not await the propitious pecking of the chickens! But Regulus observed the auguries, yet he was made prisoner. Mancinus paid religious regard to them, and yet was compelled to surrender and pass under the yoke. Paulus, at Cannæ, had chickens that ate well; yet he was overthrown, and Rome had nearly fallen with him. Julius Cæsar treated the auguries with contempt, made a prosperous voyage, and gained a great victory. The oracles, Octavius attributes, to the agency of demons; referring, in support of his assertion, to the demon of Socrates and the writings of Plato. The alleged appearance of Castor and Pollux he explains in the same way; as well as the ship's being drawn by means of the matron's girdle. He appeals to the confessions of the demons, when driven from the bodies of men by the command of Christians, as known to his opponent. Therefore, he continues, the demons flee themselves from the Christians, although by your means they persecute them. They so take possession of the minds of men, and harden their hearts, that they begin to hate us before they know us; lest, should they come to know us, they might learn to imitate us, or at least refrain from injuring us. But how unjust it is to condemn without knowledge or investigation, you may learn from us proselytes. We were once as credulous as you. We, also, believed that Christians worshipped monsters, devoured infants, and gave themselves up, in assemblies, to promiscuous and incestuous lusts; not reflecting that there was not the slightest evidence to support charges so foul; that no initiate had ever disclosed them; though he would have been sure, not only of pardon, but of the approval and thanks of the tribunal.

Whatever explanation may be given of demoniac agency, the period of the promulgation of Christianity, whether it bore analogy to any thing now existing on the earth or not, possession was, beyond question, a real malady, probably affecting both mind and body, and its sudden cure by our Saviour and his Apostles, not the least among the exhibitions of superhuman power, exerted for the relief of suffering humanity, and in attestation of the Divine authority of Christianity. It is worthy of remark, that, although Hume has demonstrated the impossibility of a miracle, or, at least, its utter incredibility under any weight of evidence, we find Octavius, or if you prefer it, Minucius, speaking, as it were,

incidentally of the miraculous power, possessed by Christians, as an incontrovertible fact.

Two centuries had now passed away since our blessed Saviour came to sojourn on this earth; came, as Himself declared, to bring, not peace, but a sword; and the uncompromising spirit of Christianity had raised up against it hosts of embittered enemies; yet, in the very Capital of the Empire, a Christian apologist claims for his co-religionists this wonder-working power, which he must, therefore, have been well assured could not be denied. This evidence of the continuance in the Church, to so late a day, of the power over Unclean Spirits, is the stronger from the circumstance of its not being brought forward in attestation of the Divine claims of the new religion, but merely introduced, by the way, as an illustration of a very different argument. Octavius proceeds to retort upon the Pagan rites, and especially upon the Egyptian, to which Cœcilius had shown his inclination by that adoration of Serapis which had produced the discussion, the gravest of the charges his antagonist had made against the Christians. While Christians were falsely accused of worshipping an ass's head, the disciples of Isis offered adoration to living asses; paying them as much honor as they did the goddess herself. He instances, also, the worship of the bull Apis, of serpents, and crocodiles, and of many other animals: beasts, birds and fishes. He declared that they reverenced an onion no less than they did Isis, and paid to the vilest things as much adoration as they did to Serapis.

You suppose, he adds, that, since we have neither temple nor altar, we desire to conceal the object of our worship. What image, he ask, could we make of God, in whose likeness man was fashioned? What temple can we build for Him, when the whole universe, His own handi-work, cannot contain Him? Is He not best sanctified in our own minds, and consecrated in our inmost hearts? What sacrifice can we offer to Him, who Himself created all things? The offering, most acceptable to Him, is a good heart, and a pure conscience. He, therefore, who cultivates innocence, worships God; he who regards justice, offers to Him a libation; he who abstains from fraud, propitiates his favor; he who rescues a fellow man from peril, offers a rich victim. These are our sacrifices, these our sacred rites; and among us he worships God the best, who best loves his brethren. It is true, we neither exhibit our God to others, nor ourselves behold Him. And, indeed, we believe in Him the more firmly, for the very

reason, that, while intimately conscious of His inflence, we can nowhere perceive Him. We see Him in His works; we trace His power in the thunder and the lightning, in the storm-cloud and in the serene sky.

But you say that God knows not the acts of men; that, seated in the heavens, He could not at the same time watch over the whole and observe individuals. Thou errest, O man, the speaker exclaims, thou art deceived! How can God be far removed, when all things in heaven and in the earth, and things beyond these narrow limits, are known to Him? Everywhere, He is not so much near us as infused into our very existence. The Creator of all things, He beholds all things; He sees us in the darkness; He knows our inmost thoughts. To the taunt of Cœcilius, that the worship of one God had not benefitted the Jews, Octavius replies by an appeal to Josephus and Antonius Julianus for evidence that while they were obedient to God, they became wealthy and powerful; and that they declined in exact proportion to their neglect of His service. He says that Christians bury their dead rather than burn them, because interment is the older and better practice; and not that burning the body would prevent its resurrection. That whether the body is burned, or buried, or suffered to melt gradually away, the component elements are in the keeping of God. But the truth of the resurrection is foreshadowed by all we see around us; the sun sets and rises again; the stars disappear and return; flowers die and revive; trees renew their leaves, and seeds decay before they grow. So the body in the grave, like plants in the winter, seems to dry up and wither away; let us patiently wait till the winter has passed, and to us, also, there will come a spring and a revival. But I know, he continues, that many prefer to disbelieve a resurrection, because they dread it; and, in a paragraph of great eloquence, he draws a comparison between the life of the Pagans and of the Christians. He claims for the latter a far purer morality, and declares that no Christians were imprisoned, save on account of their religion. That most of us, he adds, are poor, does not lessen our happiness. Our present life we regard as a discipline and a preparation for another; in which we are assured of everlasting felicity. We shall, therefore, be happy when we rise from the dead, and we are happy now with looking forward to our future blessedness.

This peroration of Octavius, of which we have been able

to give but a brief sketch, is extremely spirited; and when he had concluded it, his two hearers continued for some time lost in silent admiration. At length, while the Umpire is mentally reviewing the arguments that have been advanced, Cœcilius suddenly exclaims: I sincerely congratulate my dear Octavius, and rejoice also for myself. We need not await the Umpire's decision; we are both victorious; as Octavius over me, so I over error; and he goes on to acknowledge, in a few graceful sentences, his conviction of the truth of Christianity. Minucius expresses his double satisfaction; that he has been spared the invidious task of awarding the victory, and that Cœcilius has been so happily converted. As the sun was now rapidly approaching the West, the three friends, with a pious recognition of the Divine guidance in the events of the day, just closing, now, more than ever, endeared to each other, return to their homes rejoicing.

We have thus given an outline of this interesting treatise; not aiming to satisfy the reader's curiosity, but if possible, to induce each one to peruse it himself. Two centuries ago it enjoyed a deserved popularity, as is evidenced by numerous editions and commentaries, both in England and in various parts of the continent of Europe; but in later times it has fallen into almost complete oblivion; and we shall rejoice if we can persuade even a few of our readers, to become better acquainted with it.

It will have been observed that the debate has the Ciceronian, and not the Socratic form; and, while this arrangement makes the dialogue less lively, in our judgment it renders it more probable, that Minucius has given us a record of a real occurrence. It is to be remembered that all the interlocutors had been regularly trained in the schools of rhetoric; in which, at that period, we know the authority of Cicero was paramount, and his writings, the great model. When Cœcilius challenged Octavius to a regular discussion, in the manner of the schools of philosophy, it was quite natural that the speakers should follow the accustomed plan; and, accordingly, as we read the little volume, we are forcibly reminded of the Philosphic Dialogues of Cicero; and, perhaps, more especially of the *De Natura Deorum.* Besides, the Socratic Dialogue requires, and implies, a great intellectual superiority on the part of the advocate of the truth. It is the work, of no ordinary mind, gradually to lead on the respondent, by a series of admissions, of which he little suspects the consequences, to involve himself in an inexplicable web of reason-

ing, from which, escape is hopeless, and his defeat becomes inevitable. In the Octavius, the two disputants are too nearly matched for either to undertake the part of Socrates, even if their scolastic training had not indisposed them for the effort. Their style and plan of debate would naturally be modelled on those of their African schools, rather than on those, which had made the pompous sophists objects of laughter in the streets and market places of Athens. But the Ciceronian form, if less sprightly, is much more regular; and in regularity of plan, the two debates do very great credit to their African instructors.*

---

# ARTICLE IV.

## ANNOTATIONS ON MATTH. CHAP. XXIV.

FROM A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW, IN THE COURSE OF PREPARATION.

*Christ foretells the destruction of Jerusalem, ver.* 1, 2, *and the calamities and trials of believers which shall precede it,* 3–13; *distinguishes from these events the end of the world,* 14; *utters instructions and warnings in reference to the fall of the city and the signs of that event,* 15–25; *again distinguishes from these the signs of his coming at the end of the world,* 27–31; *pronounces the parable of the fig-tree,* 32–35; *describes his last coming,* 36–41; *and teaches all men to watch and to prepare for the hour of death,* 42–51.

### PARALLEL PASSAGES.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MATTH. 24: | 1—21 | 22—28 | 29—36 | 37—41 | 42 | 43—51 |
| MARK, 13: | 1—19 | 20—23 | 24—32 | ..... | 33 | |
| LUKE, 21: | 5—23 | ..... | 25—33 | ..... | 36 | |

### PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

A. The interpretation of this chapter is attended with peculiar difficulties. The Lord evidently refers in it to two

*After this article was prepared, the writer's attention was called to an old number of Frazer's Magazine, containing an interesting review of an English edition of the Octavius, by the Rev. H. A. Holden, M. A., published in 1853, by Jno. W. Parker, London. This edition, which, from the reviewer's account of it, is all that could be desired, may be easily procured; or, possibly, one of our American publishers might be induced to reprint it.

distinct events, one of which, the destruction of Jerusalem, occurred eighteen centuries ago; the other, the end of the world, is still a future, and, possibly, a very distant event. To the former, for instance, he undeniably alludes in ver. 6–9, to the latter in ver. 14, for it occurs *after* the gospel shall have been "preached in all the world;" to the former, again, in ver. 15, ff., to the latter, evidently in ver. 30, 31; to the former very plainly in v. 34, to the latter almost as plainly in v. 36, 37. These transitions in his discourse from the one to the other of two events which are so widely separated in time and character, are so frequent, that without the adoption of some key which may open up the cause of such wandering from one to the other, it is often very difficult to account for them, and, in any particular case, to determine to which of the two his words specially refer. It is not to be supposed for one moment that the Lord spoke in a confused or incoherent manner, or passed from one event suddenly to the other without a sufficient reason. A great diversity of interpretations has been occasioned by the apparently desultory manner of speaking which some have here ascribed to the Lord; of the various modes of explaining the whole, which have been attempted, no one has yet been generally adopted. The key which we here propose is described below in Prel. Obs. F.

Obs. B. As our Lord often employs illustrative similitudes in his discourses, like those in ch. 6 : 29; 11 : 16; 23 : 27, besides fully developed parables, (as in ch. 13,) in order to give vividness and distinctness to his lessons, so, too, as many interpreters believe, he adopts the same method in this chapter. The fearful events which preceded and attended the destruction of the city of Jerusalem are, as they maintain, regarded by him as appropriate images of the solemn scenes which will occur at the end of the world. If, therefore, the same prophetic words in any verse do not directly refer to both events, they may still, even when they describe the fall of Jerusalem only, be intended to furnish an image of another future and more awful event—the end of the world. This mode of interpretation, however, without accounting for the apparent confusion of thought in the discourse, obscures the meaning of various verses, and has always failed to remove the reader's perplexity.

Obs. C. The laws of perspective have here been presented by other interpreters as an illustration of the language of prophecy, and then applied to this discourse. To a spectator

standing on a lofty eminence, two remote objects may appear to be in close proximity; when he subsequently proceeds to the locality, he finds that they are really far asunder. In the sketch of the artist, buildings, bridges, &c., that are near him, are distinctly defined; those that are very remote, seem crowded together, and the intermediate distance is scarcely perceptible. So prophecy often refers to events belonging to the future, which are really separated by wide intervals of time, by years and even by centuries; yet they are described rapidly without any intimation of the fact that they will actually occur at periods of time very far remote from each other. Compare 2 Sam. 7 : 12–16, where the history of Solomon and the establishment of the Messiah's throne are both revealed, without any specification of the times. Thus, too, no intimation is given in Isai. 9 : 6, 7 that the full development of the Messiah's kingdom will occur long after his birth; compare also Isai. 11 : 1–6; chap. 53; 60 : 1–3. Jerem. 23 : 5; 31 : 31–34; Ezek. 34 : 23–28; 36 : 24–38; Dan. 2 : 36–45. This mode of interpretation does not remove the apparent obscurity of the present chapter, and is not successful in explaining it; the fatal objection to its fundamental principle is furnished by the fact that the Lord, unlike the ancient prophets, *does* here intentionally discriminate between the times of the two events.

Obs. D. While God has been pleased to reveal future *events*, he has always absolutely withheld all precise statements respecting the *times* of their occurrence, of which circumstance even two of the last of the prophets furnish illustrations, Hag. 2 : 6–9; Mal. 3 : 1. The Old Test. abounds in predictions respecting the Messiah, and describes his whole history, from his birth in Bethlehem to the completion of his atoning work, and the permanent establishment of his Church. But even the most definite expression of the *times* which it affords in any passage, Dan. 9 : 24–27 ("seventy weeks"), is obviously and purposely given in obscure terms. It seems that it would have been unwise in itself and of an evil influence, if the times of predicted events had been revealed to man. His watchfulness, his spirit of prayer, his faith in God—all his Christian graces owe their brightness to his continual preparations for his death; see 24 : 42 C. When Daniel asked a question like that of the disciples, ver. 3, the significant answer was: "Go thy way—the words are closed up and sealed &c," Dan. 12 : 8, 9. Hence

the risen Saviour absolutely and in the most positive terms refused such revelations even to his disciples, Acts 1 : 7. They lived and died without that knowledge, 1 Thess. 5 : 1, 2; 2 Pet. 3 : 10, and only knew that the end of all things might be long deferred, 2 Thess. 2 : 2. So strictly has the Almighty withheld such knowledge from all his creatures, that "of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the *angels* of heaven," 24 : 36; indeed, so unsuited to human nature is a knowledge of this deep mystery, that Christ remarks of himself, in reference to his human nature, when he "took upon him the form of a servant," Phil. 2 : 7, that even HE, in the days of his humiliation dispensed for the time with a knowledge of "that day and that hour," Mark 13 : 32, even as he in other points then "made himself of no reputation," and did not publicly manifest his eternal equality with God, Phil. 2 : 5, 7. Under such circumstances, we may naturally expect that all the revelations given in the present chapter, will be so presented to our feeble eyes, as if a veil partially obscured the heavenly light which, if fully revealed, would dazzle and overpower our nature.

OBS. E. While then the mere curiosity of man is by no means indulged, the Lord amply provides in the present chapter for our spiritual and real wants in the following manner:—It cannot be essential to our true welfare to know the precise time of the end of the world—an event which may occur long after our death. BUT it *is* of unspeakable importance to us to be properly prepared for the judgment which will be held at that time. Now our future and eternal condition in the other world will be decided altogether by our acceptance of Christ in true faith, or our practical rejection of him in this present life; no means of grace, nor any opportunity to repent and reform will be furnished after death (OBS. F. § 5.) Hence, the day of our death as individuals will virtually be the same to us, as if it were "the day of the coming of the Lord to judgment." Those who had died previously to this event, including ourselves, and those who shall then be living on earth, when it does occur, will be treated by the Judge precisely in the same manner, according to 1 Thess. 4 : 15 (where the old English word *prevent*, for which see 17 : 25 B., corresponds to the modern *precede* or *anticipate*.) To all these, without distinction, the words in 2 Cor. 5 : 10 apply. Hence, as on the one hand, no apostle could indicate the time of the end of the world, and as, on the other, the death of the individual placed him, as far

as his own sentence was concerned, precisely in the situation of those who shall be alive when the end of all things does come, the sacred writers regard both of the times—the day of the individual's death, and the day of the Lord's coming—as equivalent, or virtually coinciding, the one with the other. See, for instance, Phil. 4 : 5; 1 Pet. 4 : 7; 2 Pet. 3 : 10–14; James 5 : 8, 9; 1 John 2 : 28.———Thus the Lord by his personal instructions and by those which he imparts to us through his apostles, teaches us to live daily in the expectation of his coming, that is, to live daily with eternity in view.

Obs. F. The interpreter of the following chapter will possibly not be perplexed by any apparent confusion in it arising from a supposed unaccountable transition from the one event to the other, if the following circumstances be considered:—

§1. No one of the four evangelists attempts to record *all* the sayings and deeds of the Lord, John 21 : 25. The one omits circumstances which another may be induced by the general object for which he writes, and under the guidance of the divine Spirit, to introduce fully. Even in the present discourse, while Matthew furnishes much matter which Mark and Luke omit (for example 24 : 37–41; ver. 45—51, and the whole of ch. 25, except the reference in Mark 13 : 34), he omits certain portions which they record, Mark 13 : 35–37, Luke 21 : 24, 34, 36. Hence we learn that as on other occasions (comp. Matth. 19 : 2 with Mark 10 : 1), *all* the words of the Lord have not been preserved; much less can we expect that all the questions and remarks of the disciples should be written in full.

§2. *Matth. sometimes omits portions of conversations* between Christ and his disciples or the people; thus he occasionally presents answers of the Saviour only, without introducing the questions or remarks of his hearers which occasioned those answers. This important fact, which constitutes the key that is applied in the following explanation, is verified by the following references:—The command given in Mt. 4 : 19, and the immediate obedience of the two fishers, are made perfectly plain only by a reference to Luke 5 : 3–10. The cause of the cry described in 8 : 29 is explained in Mark 5 : 8 and Luke 8 : 29. The reason of the charge given in 12 : 16 is found in Mark 3 : 11, 12. In 14 : 8 the substance only of the conversation is given which appears in Mark 5 : 24, 25. In 14 : 16, 17 the substance again is given

of a conversation recorded in Mark 5 : 37, 38. In 18 : 1 the cause of the Lord's question is not given, but it is stated in Mark 9 : 33–36. The words in 19 : 9 seem to be a continuation of an address to the Pharisees, but they really constitute an answer to a question privately addressed to the Lord by the disciples, according to Mark 10 : 10. The words in 26 : 31 were doubtless called forth by language like that occurring in John 13 : 37. So, too, many details are omitted in 9 : 50 ff.; 17 : 14 ff., which are found respectively in Mark 5 : 25 ff., Luke 8 : 43, and in Mark 9 : 14 ff., Luke 9 : 38 ff. Luke furnishes illustrations not found in Matth. of occasional interruptions of the Lord's discourses by short questions of the disciples in 12 : 41; 17 : 37.

§ 3. The whole of the present discourse is exhibited here by Matth. in a massive, unbroken form, beginning at 24 : 4 and extending to the end of ch. 25. However he furnishes the key to the whole in 24 : 3, where the disciples are introduced *as addressing certain questions to him*, (see below, at the verse). Since their occasional questions convey no definite information, *he repeats none* that are afterwards directed to the Lord, but records continuously *the Lord's own words only*. We may here assume, therefore, without precisely fixing the forms of the several questions, that *this long discourse embodies extended answers* of the Lord *to a succession of questions* from the perturbed disciples. They are greatly perplexed; they are not yet aware that many centuries will intervene between the fall of the city and the end of all things; they ask many questions, the substance of which alone is given in 24 : 3.

§ 4. The whole discourse, as here presented, furnishes accordingly the substance of a prolonged conversation held "privately" 24 : 3 between the Lord and "Peter, James, John and Andrew" Mark 13 : 3, of whom the three former were admitted to various solemn scenes, which no other disciples witnessed; see above 17 : 1 B. Luther remarks incidentally in one of his sermons: "Matthew here records, not a formal discourse, but a free and unrestrained conversation." And Stier, a recent interpreter of distinguished ability, also remarks incidentally, (without further applying the principle in his explanation of the chapter): "Probably our Lord did not speak continuously and without certain pauses, in the form in which the discourse is here presented." (Reden, II, 466. A similar arrangement of extended answers to questions occurs in ch. 18, see v. 1 and 21, after which Matth. re-

marks in 19 : 1 that "Jesus finished these sayings"=these discourses. The same expression, occurring below in 26 : 1, indicates that here also the Lord's several answers to various questions implied by the word "*all*," are combined as one discourse. Thus one of the pauses in the conversation at the end of v. 31, not mentioned by Matth. is very distinctly visible in the parallel passage Luke 21 : 29; this observation, that the Lord here introduced a parable, evidently shows that the Lord did not speak continuously or without occasional pauses or questions from the disciples· At another parallel place Luke 21 : 10 there is also an indication of a pause in the discourse. And in the abrupt transition in 25 : 14 there appears a trace of another interruption, indicating that various connecting words have been omitted; a comparison of the passage with Mark 13 : 34, where the whole parable is compressed in one verse, will exhibit even more extensive omissions in the latter.

§ 5. We may then explain the contents of ch. 24 and ch. 25 according to the following principle:—This whole discourse really consists of several distinct series of "sayings" (26 : 1) or remarks which are pronounced partly in answer to occasional questions of the four disciples, not recorded by Matth. but indicated by Mark and Luke to a certain extent, and partly prompted by the Lord's knowledge of their wishes or spiritual wants. An exact specification of the time or times of future events he absolutely refuses to give; but the signs of coming events, on the one hand, he reveals, while, on the other, he desires to impress on them and those whom they should afterwards instruct, the solemn truth that to each individual his own death is equivalent to the end of all things, since that individual's final sentence is virtually decided by his moral state when he dies, Eccl. 9 : 10. The following divisions seem to offer themselves to our view:

a) Ch. 24 : 4–13. Here in answer to the question in v. 3, respecting the sign (= indication) that "these things" mentioned in 23 : 36 are at hand, the Lord presents a rapid view of the trials of believers which will precede the fall of Jerusalem.

b) 24 : 14. To that point in the question which assumed that these events will coincide in time with his last coming at the end of the world, the Lord, carefully distinguishing between the two, answers in the negative; see below, v. 14.

c) 24 : 15–26. The disciples here possibly express their deep interest in the former event, that is, in their future

trials, the dispersion of the nation, &c.; the Lord, resuming the subject by saying: "therefore" (see below, v. 15 A.) now gives additional warnings and instructions intended to guide their conduct.

d) 24 : 27–31. These words, introduced by the word "For" (see v. 27 B.) are doubtless the answer to a question expressed or indicated, and are intended to show that the scenes which will precede his final coming to judgment will differ materially from those that shall precede the fall of the city.

e) 24 : 32–35. Here the Lord makes a pause in the discourse which is distinctly marked in Luke 21 : 29, but not mentioned by Matth. He recurs to the point which most of all interested his disciples, who exhibit deep emotion, and possibly renew their questions; he reminds them that he has now revealed with sufficient fulness the character of the events which shall precede the fall of the city.

f) 24 : 36–41. The Lord, who hitherto had spoken not for the purpose of gratifying an idle curiosity, but rather of reaching the heart, desires now to impress the truth on the minds of his disciples, that his last coming and the end of the world are events of far greater importance than the fall of the Jewish state. This whole passage, as an independent portion, is omitted by Luke in ch. 21, between v. 33 and v. 34.

g) 24 : 42—25 : 30. At this point the disciples are apparently too deeply moved to interpose new questions; the Lord proceeds to discuss the new point already introduced in v. 36 ff., namely that the death of each individual is really "the end" in his own case, and illustrates man's responsibility by parables; see below 24 : 44 C.

h) 25 : 31–46. He completes the solemn revelations by a description of the Last Judgment, which will extend to all individuals of the human race.

Obs. G. Various remarks which occur in this conversation, had been previously made by the Lord in his public discourses; comp. besides the parallel passages in Luke ch. 21, also Luke 12 : 36–40 and 17 : 24–36. These remarks, which were not then fully understood by the disciples (see below v. 36 A), are now repeated in a connection which renders their meaning more distinct.

## Annotations.

Verse 1. And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple: and his disciples came to *him* for to shew him the buildings of the temple.

A. **departed—temple**; the Lord never returned to it—before the week closed, he was crucified.—B. **disciples &c.** They did not *show* these buildings to him as a stranger; the Greek word implies that they *pointed out, called his attention to* them, as it is also used in Luke 17 : 14; 24 : 40; Acts 9 : 39; they indicated that *these* were the special objects of their interest at the moment, inquiring indirectly whether the awful words just pronounced: "Your house &c." 23 : 38, could possibly refer to these sacred buildings.—C. **buildings**; the term comprehends all the magnificent structures (cloisters, pillars, walls &c.) which were connected with the temple (4 : 5, E) and which Herod during his long reign, and the Jewish authorities after his day, had erected, John 2 : 20. See Josephus, *Antiq.* 15, ch. 11; 20, 9, 7; *War*, 5, 5. He remarks that 18,000 workmen had been employed, and that the "goodly stones" Luke 21 : 5 of the sacred edifice, or rather, of its foundation, were "white and strong; their length was 25 cubits, their height was 8, and their breadth about 12." *Ant.* 15, 11, 3. Josephus elsewhere (*War*, 5, 5, 5,) describes some of the stones of the walls as having been "45 cubits in length, 5 in height, and 5 in breadth." (A cubit is usually reckoned at one foot and a half in length, but see above, ch. 6 : 27 B.)—Josephus, a Jewish historian of undoubted veracity has left a full account of the Jewish War, which, without any such intention on his part, affords many remarkable illustrations of the words spoken by the Lord in this chapter.

Verse 2. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily, I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

**See ye not - - - thrown down.**=These various objects to which you point, I *do* mean; all those massive walls will inevitably be broken down, and desolation and ruin will overwhelm the whole.—The Romans literally fulfilled this prediction, according to Josephus, *War* 7, 1, 1, inasmuch as, after the capture of the city, when "the enemy had no more people to slay or plunder - - then they demolished the entire city and temple," except some portions which were spared as trophies of the victory; the very foundation was dug up, and all

traces of an inhabited city destroyed, according to Josephus. The prophecy in Micah 3 : 12 was a description of events that all came to pass.

VERSE 3 ¶. And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?

A. **And as he sat - - Olives.**—The original implies that after he had reached this spot, on leaving the temple, and seated himself, the disciples came to him. The temple and the city, the approaching ruin of which filled their minds with gloom and terror, were in full view; see for "the mount of Olives" annot. to 21 : 1.—B. **the disciples - - privately**; only four of the whole number are here meant, Mark 13 : 3, and see PREL. OBS. F. § 4. The term *privately* (= *apart*, 17 : 19, *when they were alone*, Mark 4 : 34) doubtless refers to the absence of the other disciples, as on somewhat similar occasions of deep import.—C. **Tell us - - - world.** According to the view presented above, PREL. OBS. F. § 3. Matth. places the questions here, in order to indicate that the prolonged discourse which follows, was occasioned by certain interrogations to which the Lord furnished replies. The first of the *two* questions refers to the *precise time* of the occurrence of "these things" which the Lord had mentioned in 23 : 35, and now repeats in v. 2. The second question, which embraces several particulars, or, rather, exhibits a fusion of several questions, is to be viewed in connection with the following facts:—There were certain lessons which, previously to the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was poured out, Acts, ch. 2, the disciples were not prepared nor qualified to learn, as the Lord indeed told them, John 16 : 12, 13. Even after his resurrection their impatience to know the future, and their incorrect views are gently rebuked by the Lord, Acts 1 : 5, 7. Here, at a still earlier day, the same ignorance or confusion of thought is strikingly manifested by them. They are not distinctly conscious that the end of world will be widely separated in time from the overthrow of the Jewish state, and imagine that the "coming" of the Lord, when Jerusalem shall fall, on the one hand, and the end of the world, on the other, will coincide in the time. The questions here stated by Matth. probably contain the substance of several others referring chiefly to the sign of those momentous events, by which the disciples may know that these are at hand; they, moreover, appear to imagine

that the "end of the world" is so near that they may still live when it occurs. They remember indeed the remarkable words spoken in 16 : 27, 28 and 19 : 28; but of the *times* of the events there revealed, they had yet no clear conception, and the events themselves were not clearly comprehended by them at this period.—D. thy coming; on this subject see above, 10 : 23 B.—E. the end of the world. For the term here translated *world* see 12 : 32 C. Precisely the same Greek phrase occurs in 13 : 39, 40 and 28 : 20; both there and in the present verse, it cannot possibly mean simply the end of the Jewish state, but can only refer to the end of all things—the passing away of this earth.

VERSE 4. And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you.

**Take heed &c.**—=Be on your guard, hold fast to my instructions, and believe no one whose doctrines differ from mine; you will be exposed to many trials of your faith before these massive buildings shall be cast down. Such watchfulness and self-examination on your part will be of more value to you than a direct answer to your question respecting the time ("when").—The warning is repeated by Paul, Eph. 5 : 6; Col. 2 : 8; 2 Thess. 2 : 3. As in a similar case, Luke 13 : 23, 24, so the Lord here, while refusing to give a direct answer, replies by uttering a solemn admonition: "he began to say &c.," Mark 13 : 5, that is, he introduced in succession several topics in his extended answer.

VERSE 5. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.

**For many &c.**=The reason for giving you this warning lies in the fact that many &c.—The original, in which the Greek name *Christ* is equivalent to *Messiah* (see 1 : 1 B) implies:—Each shall falsely assume my name and character, saying, I am the Messiah.—Each of these impostors would succeed in persuading "many" that he was the promised deliverer. Many impostors and deceivers arose among the Jews, according to the testimony of Josephus (*Antiq.* 20, 8, 6; *War* 2, 13, 5) before the city was destroyed. Thus he mentions the Egyptian, whom the chief captain, in the first alarm, supposed Paul to be (Acts 21 : 38); this man, like others, pretended that he would exhibit signs and wonders, and, as it was estimated, about 30,000 individuals were "deceived" by

him. Others who pretended respectively to be "some great one" or "the great power of God" like Simon the sorcerer, Theudas and Judas of Galilee, are already mentioned incidentally in Acts 5 : 36, 37; 8 : 9, 10. Our historical records have not preserved the name of any impostor who ventured to announce himself to the public without any disguise as the Messiah, before the fall of the city; such pretensions were no doubt confined to the small circles of the initiated, while the Jewish authorities retained their power. Hence Dositheus, the Samaritan, the founder of a numerous sect during the age of the apostles, publicly claimed to be only the prophet announced in Deut. 18 : 18, but doubtless in private described himself as "the Christ." After the fall of the city, when detection was less prompt and easy, many "false Christs" appeared, of whom the one best known, Barchochebas or Bar-Cochba (=*Son of a star*, the ambitious title which he assumed in allusion to Numb. 24 : 17) perished in the year 135. Such a "false Christ" could possibly claim that he was the Lord Jesus himself, and that his promised "coming" now occurred. Hence the Lord discriminates carefully in the subsequent discourse between the era of the fall of Jerusalem, which alone concerned the disciples personally, and the distant period when the general Judgment will occur.

VERSE 6. And ye shall hear of wars, and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all *these things* must come to pass, but the end is not yet.

A. wars and rumors of wars=while a bloody war prevails in one part of the Roman Empire, ye will be alarmed with tidings that wars are on the point of commencing elsewhere.—The Romans repeatedly threatened war against the Jews before the reign of Vespasian. The Lord possibly alludes to the wars of the Romans with the Parthians, to the enormous numbers of Jews slain in the Syrian and other cities (Jos. *War*, 8, 2, 18; *Ant.* 20 ch. 3 and 4), to the wars of rival emperors, Otho, Vitellius &c. Large portions of the Roman Empire were convulsed by war during the whole period preceding the fall of the city.—B. be not troubled=do not vainly believe that these convulsions, which will occur long before the Gospel shall have reached all nations, indicate the actual end of the world.—It is worthy of observation that when Paul imparts precisely the same lesson to the Thessalonians, he employs the same word rendered "troubled"=*disturbed, alarmed*, 2 Thes. 2 : 2.—C. for all--not

yet=for the end of the world, concerning which ye inquired (ver. 3), is not indicated by these events.—Hence, vast and bloody wars, and even the fall of empires, by no means constitute sure signs of the near approach of the end of the world.—"all these thins"=now mentioned in reference to the fall of the city, see v. 34.—"must"=certainly will, see 16 : 21 C.

VERSE 7. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places.

**For nation &c.** The Lord here refers to the language of the prophets (for instance Isai. 19 : 2; Jerem. 51 : 46 as well as 2 Chron. 15 : 6) with which the disciples were familiar, and which described in general terms great political convulsions, national calamities and wars; the terms employed, as it is obvious, refer here to *facts*, and are to be literally understood.—"famines"; one of great severity, which occurred A. D. 49, is incidentally mentioned in Acts 11 : 28, where as in 7 : 11, the same Greek word is rendered *dearth*; it is sometimes rendered *hunger*, as in Luke 15 : 17, 2 Cor. 11 : 27, but *famine* in Rom. 8 : 35. See Jos. *Antig.* 20, 2, 5.—"pestilences"; here a general name is employed, indicating calamities like the oriental Plague, or any malignant diseases that are contagious or infectious, as well as epidemic and mortal. One pestilence alone in A. D. 65, in a single autumn, carried off 30,000 persons in Rome. The tremendous scourge of the pestilence is often mentioned in the Old Test., Lev. 26 : 25; 1 kings 8 : 37; Ps. 91 : 3, 6, Ezek. 7 : 15.—"earthquakes." These are also frequently mentioned in the O. Test., Isai. 24 : 20; 29 : 6, and have occurred on many occasions in the Holy Land as well as in other countries. In addition to several others occurring between A. D. 46 and A. D. 60, in "divers (=*sundry*, *various*) places" in the Roman Empire, and mentioned by historians, there was a violent earthquake in the year 63, or about seven years before the fall of the city, in the neighborhood of mount Vesuvius, which partially destroyed Pompeii (Tac. *Ann.* 15 : 22, the earthquake which completely ruined it as well as Herculaneum, occurred about 16 years afterwards, A. D. 79. Previously, during the reign of Tiberius, thirteen cities of Asia Minor were destroyed in one night by an earthquake.—The imperfect historical records referring to that period, that are extant, do not furnish full details of the events which the Lord here predicts.

VERSE 8. All these *are* the beginning of sorrows.

**All these &c.**=such events, as a mere "beginning," will be succeded by greater horrors which will ultimately overwhelm the city and the whole nation.—The Greek word for "sorrows," occurring also in Acts 2 : 24 indicates originally pangs which are intense but also of comparatively short duration= throes, 1 Thess. 5 : 3, John 16 : 21.

VERSE 9. Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake.

A. **Then shall they---kill you.** ("Shall" is here simply the sign of the future tense=*will.*) Similar predictions had already been made in 10 : 17; 23 : 34. They possibly refer to cases like that of Stephen, Acts. 7 : 59, James, Acts 12 : 2, and the persecution of the Christians under the emperor Nero, during whose reign the apostles Peter and Paul are said to have suffered martyrdom.—B. **ye shall be hated &c.**=the Jews will regard you as enemies of their religion and consequently as enemies of God, and *all nations* (=Gentiles) will hate you. See above, 10 : 22 A, and comp. Acts 6 : 14 and 26 : 9 with John 16 : 2; see also Acts 28 : 22, 1 Cor. 4 : 13; 1 Pet. 2 : 12; 3 : 16; 4 : 14.—**"for my name's sake"**=as Christians, 1 Pet. 4 : 16, as adherents of Christ, whom the Jews with impious unbelief denied and slew, and to whose disciples they transferred their original hatred of the Lord Jesus, Acts 4 : 2. An ancient writer states that the very name—*a Christian*—when it was heard by the heathen, provoked a war against itself, as if it implied a crime.

VERSE 10. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another.

A. **offended**=shall stumble and fall, shall allow such trials to shake their faith, to destroy their confidence in God, and to renounce the Christian religion, 13 : 21; for the word "*offend*" see 5 : 29 C, and for illustrations, 2 Tim. 1 : 15; 4 : 10, 16, 1 John 2 : 19, and comp. Hebr. 12 : 3 ff.—B. **betray one another**=through fear of persecution or through bribes, some professed believers will denounce their brethren to their persecutors. Such scenes occurred during the reign of Nero, a few years before the fall of the city. (Tac. *Ann.* 15, 44).—C. **and shall hate &c.**=these treacherous and apostate Christians will act as enemies that hate.—The Lord here repeats, according to Mark 13 : 12 words that he had uttered once before, see above 10 : 21.

VERSE 11. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many.

**And many false prophets &c.** See 7 : 15 B, and above, ann. to ver. 5. These cautions are repeated by Paul, Acts 20 : 29, 30; 2 Cor. 11 : 13; Gal. 1 : 7; 1 Tim. 4 : 1; 2 Tim. 3 : 1, by Peter, 2 Pet. 2 : 1, and by John, 1 John 2 : 18; see below, v. 23.

VERSE 12. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.

**And because &c.** The iniquity that abounds is partly the iniquity or unbelief of the persecutors, partly the unfaithfulness and apostacy of professing Christians, to which persecution in some cases leads; comp. 2 Tim. 3 : 1–5.—"wax," see 13 : 15 A.—Love, the great Christian principle, 22 : 37–40, the most holy emotion which the human heart is made capable by grace of entertaining, is compared to the sacred fire which burned perpetually on the altar, Lev. 6 : 9–13, and could become extinct only in consequence of criminal negligence. "*Many*," forbearing to watch and pray and hold fast to the divine promises, will allow the grateful love with which they had professed the name of Christ, and the fraternal love with which they had regarded their brethren, to be extinguished by fear or other unholy emotions, and will renounce a cause which involves them in severe earthly trials, 2 Thess. 2 : 3; 2 Tim. 1 : 15; Hebr. 10 : 25.

VERSE 13. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.

**But he &c.** For the future encouragement of believers, when the trials here predicted, shall occur, the Lord, at the close of this portion of his address, graciously promises eternal salvation (=perfect and eternal deliverance from all evil, 2 Pet. 2 : 9; 2 Tim. 4 4 : 18) to those who in faith "*endure*" (=*bear*, *sustain*) their trials unto the end of their course on earth; comp. 2 Tim. 2 : 12 (where the same word is rendered *suffer*) James 1 : 12; 5 : 11.—"unto (the) end" = of life, Rev. 2 : 10, as in John 13 : 1, Hebr. 3 : 14; Rev. 2 : 26. The definite article *the*, which in v. 6 and 14 gives prominence to *the great end* = the end of all things, is here omitted, and the adverbial form of the Greek phrase simply indicates the idea of *finally*, *perseveringly*.

VERSE 14. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations; and then shall the end come.

A. The rapid transition in this verse from the fall of the city to the end of the world, may be thus explained. The disciples had heard the Lord speak previously, v. 6, of a remote end; here, at the close of v. 13, in which he had employed the same word (meaning the close of the individual's life on earth) they inquired whether he declared that immediately after the events just mentioned as signs of the approaching fall of Jerusalem, the "end of the world" itself (v. 3) would occur. The phrase "*this gospel*," which indicates apparently that some reference had just been made to the "Gospel," and also the absence of the words found in Luke 21 : 19 show that Matth. has here omitted a portion of the conversation, and proceeds with his report only when the Lord himself resumes the regular discourse. This verse therefore, which gives an answer in the negative, conveys the information to the disciples that *after* the fall of the city, and *before* the end of the world, the tidings of the Gospel shall be carried to all nations, thus showing that the interval would be of comparatively great length.—B. And; the connective Greek word so translated here, like the corresponding Hebrew connective term, admits of many modes of application. The latter begins several books, Exod. 1 : ; 1 Kings 1 : 1; Ezra 1 : 1 and letters, 2 Kings 5 : 6; 10 : 2, and is translated *now*, referring generally to preceding words or facts, and also indicating that a general subject is resumed. In the New Test. it is (besides *and*) translated *but*, Mark 12 : 12, Acts 10 : 28, *therefore* 1 Cor. 5 : 13, and *for* in Acts 23 : 4, 1 John 1 : 2; 3 : 4. It is sometimes equivalent to *namely*, as in John 1 : 16 (=namely grace &c.) 1 Cor. 3 : 5 ("even"). In the present case it is equivalent to such an English term, indicating that the disciples had here interposed a question, and that the Lord said in reply: "That end of the world itself shall not come then, *for* this Gospel &c."—C. this gospel of the kingdom. The word *this* may refer to the joyful intelligence of salvation involved in the words "shall be saved," v. 13, but it more probably refers to the gospel which the disciples and their successors were to preach, and which had possibly been just mentioned in the intermediate conversation.—For the whole phrase see 4 : 23 C.—D. world; the original word, differing from that which is similarly translated in v. 3, and signifying the *inhabited* (earth), although used sometimes in a restricted sense, Luke 2 : 1; Acts 11 : 28; 19 : 27, is evidently intended, as the words "all nations," and the statement in Rom. 11 : 25 show, to designate the

habitable globe, the whole world, as in Acts 17 : 31; Rom. 10 : 18; Hebr. 1 : 6. The ancient prophecies had repeatedly declared: "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord &c.," Isai. 11 : 9; Hab. 2 : 14. But America and other portions of the globe, the homes of countless millions, were not then known even by name. Nevertheless, the Gospel was to be sent to those parts of the world too, before "the end."—E, **for a witness — nations** = bearing witness, according to the great purpose of the Gospel, John 1 : 17; Tit. 2 : 11, to all men concerning the love of God revealed in Christ, 1 Cor. 1 : 6; 2 Cor. 2 : 1. See 8 : 4 D.—F. **and then -- come** = the day of judgment will not arrive until the Gospel shall have been previously proclaimed to all nations.—"**and then**" = *thereupon, after that*, without indicating the length of the interval, as in 4 : 17; 9 : 14; 18 : 21.

VERSE 15. When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand.)

A. **therefore.** At this point the painful interest which the disciples felt in the coming events that so nearly concerned them, their nation, and their future personal labors, manifested itself by exclamations or questions, and the Lord pauses. The evidence of this fact is found in the variations occurring in the reports in Mark 13 : 14 and Luke 21 : 20; both of these evangelists prefix other words to this verse, showing that the conversation had been resumed. At this point, where the Lord again proceeds with his discourse, the three evangelists coincide substantially. Christ now furnishes additional and detailed instructions in v. 15–26 respecting the conduct of the disciples and of their Christian associates when the times of trial shall be at hand. The introductory word "therefore" indicates that he resumes the subject which he had discussed to the end of v. 13, but temporarily dropped while uttering the words in v. 14. Such resumptions after short interruptions or parentheses by means of the word *therefore* are frequent; see 7 : 24; 10 : 32, and comp. John 6 : 24 with v. 22, or Hebr. 4 : 11 with v. 6.—B. **the abomination -- place.** The prophet Daniel who lived during the sixth century before Christ, was permitted to see many future events in his visions. Among these are the remarkable revelations which he received concerning the Messiah. Josephus says: "Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate

by them," *Antiq.* 10, 11, 7. The words in the Book of Daniel to which the Lord here refers are found in ch. 9 : 26, 27; 11 : 31; 12 : 11; "the holy place," (in the original simply "*a* holy place") is supposed by some to be the temple, although Mark 13 : 14 instead of this phrase merely says: "where it ought not." That the temple cannot be meant is obvious; for when the Romans actually did offer sacrifices to their ensigns on the site of the temple, the sacred buildings had been already burnt, Jos. *War*, 6, 6, 1, while here our Lord evidently refers to a time preceding the destruction of the temple, when the escape of fugitives was still possible. Probably Judea, or the region around the city, called "the holy land" Zech. 2 : 12 is implied; like the city, (4 : 5 C) the whole land belonged to the Lord, and was regarded as holy; see Lev. 25 : 23, Jerem. 2 : 7; Hos. 9 : 3. Christ here indicates that his disciples should withdraw from the city before the temple shall be taken and destroyed; moreover, Luke who omits these words, supplies the following: "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies," 21 : 20, which evidently allude to the approach of the Roman armies with their standards exhibiting the well-known Roman eagles. (These were figures of gold or silver, about the size of a pigeon, and were borne on the tops of spears, with their wings expanded. When the army marched, the eagle was always visible to the legions, for which see 26 : 53.) These representatives of living creatures were abhorred by the Jews, Jos. *Ant.* 17, 6, 2.—The word "*stand*" (lit. *standing*) indicates a prolonged presence of the "abomination of desolation"=the desolating abomination. Now the original word for "abomination" which Daniel employs, designated any vile and odious thing, particularly when connected with the pollutions of idolatry, Zech. 9 : 7; Nahum 3 : 6; 2 Kings 23 : 24. Possibly therefore the ensigns and the images of the Roman emperor are meant, such as Pilate in vain attempted at an earlier period to introduce into Jerusalem. Jos. *War*, 2, 9, 2. So, too, when Vitellius intended to conduct an army through Judea, the Jews remonstrated effectually against the passage of the troops through their country, on account of the images in their ensigns, *Ant.* 18, 5, 3.—The sense of the whole may then be:—When the armies and ensigns of the pagan Romans establish themselves on the soil of the holy land, with the evident intent to spread desolation over it &c.—C. (whoso—understand.) Some suppose that Matth. himself introduces this parenthesis, but as it occurs

also in Mark 13 : 14, it is evidently a part of the Lord's discourse. The Lord himself, whose own words here Matth. is very careful not to interrupt at all, calls the attention of his disciples specially to Gabriel's language occurring in the ancient prophecy, Dan. 9 : 23; 12 : 10 as a guide in their own future meditations. Such brief parenthetical remarks are not uncommon; see 13 : 9, 43; John 7 : 22; Rev. 2 : 9.—"whoso readeth" =for the instruction of himself or of others.

VERSE 16. Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.

**Then &c.** =then, if ye had hitherto still lingered, do ye and all who receive my words, at once abandon the whole land, for the siege of the city, and the ruin of the country are at hand.—"Flee--mountains" =seek places of refuge, Gen. 19 : 17; Judg. 6 : 2; 1 Sam. 13 : 6.—It is said (Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* III, 5) that shortly before the fall of the city, the Christians, in obedience to this command, withdrew in a body and went beyond the Jordan to Pella, a city situated in the northern part of Peræa (Jos. *War*, 3, 3, 3) and beyond the mountainous region on the north-eastern confines of the Holy Land. See APPENDIX, *art.* DECAPOLIS, and comp. Jos. *War*, 2, ch. 19, 6, and ch. 20, 1 respecting the flight of many inhabitants of Jerusalem.

VERSE 17. Let him which is on the house-top not come down to take any thing out of his house.

**Let him &c.** The roofs of the houses were flat, affording conveniences for walking, and were sometimes selected, as in Peter's case, Acts 10 : 9, by those who sought retirement. The house-top was reached both from the interior of the house, and also by a staircase on the outside, 9 : 2 D. The Lord employs here the image of a man to whom the suddenness of the danger leaves no time to collect provisions and clothing for his flight; if the Christians linger too long in the city when the Jewish war is beginning, they will find all means of escape cut off. (Comp. Luke 17 : 31, and see above, PREL. OBS. G.)

VERSE 18. Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes.

**Neither &c.** This additional image enforces the precept of the former verse, that no time should be lost in escaping from the doomed city. The Lord designs to extinguish the last hope of his disciples that the city will be spared.—The

mantle or cloak ("clothes," 5 : 40 B) was not worn during the labors of the field; comp. John 13 : 4.

VERSE 19. And wo unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days!

And woe = *alas for*, 11 : 21, A. The Lord refers to the unspeakable miseries of the times, the dispersion of families and the painful trials which the helpless fugitives will endure, particularly referring to mothers; the allusion is to that holy principle of love which will not allow a mother to consider her own safety unless she first provides for that of her offspring, whence she is liable to perish with the latter.

VERSE 20. But pray ye that your flight be not in winter, neither on the sabbath-day.

But pray ye &c. = Let prayer and uninterrupted communion with God sustain you.—The Lord here evidently refers to believers whose faith would prompt them to prefer a painful flight to a continuance in the city. They are permitted to pray for two alleviations, first, that the privations and sufferings which necessarily attend such a flight, may not be aggravated by the severity of the season of the year, and secondly, that their flight may not be attended by circumstances or apparently necessary acts that might either provoke the Jews as violations of the letter of the law, or afterwards disturb their own peace of conscience. This point is illustrated by a reference to the manner in which a conscientious Jew regarded the observance of the sabbath, Exod. 16 : 29, Jerem. 19 : 22. The Lord designs in general to refer to two sources of trials, first, natural causes, secondly, social or religious institutions. Josephus remarks (*Ant.* 13, 8, 4) that it was not lawful for a Jew to journey on a sabbath-day or on a festival-day; for the distance called a "sabbath-day's journey," see 21 : 1.

VERSE 21. For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.

For &c. = the miseries which are approaching, will justify you in encountering the greatest perils in effecting your escape.—These unexpected disclosures of the future trials of Jews and Christians, as connected with the fall of the city, doubtless produced a marked movement among the disciples; they are deeply distressed, but have reached a period when, in the Lord's view, it is essential that they should be prepared by him for personally encountering danger in any form

without timidity or hopelessness. Hence he here reasserts in proverbial terms which refer to extraordinary calamities, Exod. 10 : 14; 11 : 6, Joel 2 : 2, that all these things will come to pass, and even exceed in severity all other known calamities, referring with emphasis to the words in Dan. 12 : 1.—The allusion doubtless is to the appalling events which preceded and followed the capture of Jerusalem; that city was crowded at the time by Jews from a distance who had assembled to keep the passover, Jos. *War*, 6, 9 § 3 and 4. The "great distress" mentioned Luke 21 : 23, 24, the murders (large fires quenched by the flowing streams of blood, Jos. *War*, 6, 8, 5), the famine and enormous crimes which it engendered (a mother, named Mary, for instance, killing her babe, roasting and eating one half of the body, *War*, 6, 3, 4) the crucifixion of so many hundreds of Jewish prisoners, "that room was wanting for the crosses, and crosses wanting for the bodies," (*War*, 5, 11, 1), in short, the slaughter of more than a million of Jews ("eleven hundred thousand perished during the whole siege," besides ninety-seven thousand who were led into captivity, *War*, 6, 9, 3)—these were indeed events to which no former age and none that succeeded, can afford a parallel; the Lord's prophetic view of them moved him to tears, Luke 19 : 14. Additional remarks on the same event are found in Luke 21 : 24.

Verse 22. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.

A. **And except** (lit. if not) -- saved =if the Lord (Mark 13 : 20) had not, in his infinite compassion, determined to arrest the course of these calamities, and restrain the passions of cruel and wicked men, "no flesh" (=no mortal, as in Jerem. 12 : 12; Rom. 3 : 20; 1 Cor. 1 : 29) could "be saved" (= escape bodily death, as in 8 : 25; 14 : 30)—death, in the form of pestilence or famine, in addition to the sword, would rage till all had perished; comp. Gen. 6 : 13.—"shortened"= *diminished in number*. The siege and capture of Jerusalem occupied a much shorter time than Titus had expected; the former commenced early in the spring of A. D. 70; the latter occurred five months afterwards, early in the autumn of the same year.—B. but — elect's sake; (for *elect* see 20 : 16 B.) The sense is: God will not permit these calamities to prevail so long that they shall overwhelm and destroy his own believing people, the Christians. "He knoweth them that trust in him," Nahum 1 : 7; 2 Tim. 2 : 19. The words

which refer to the overruling Providence of God, are designed to soothe and encourage the disciples and all afflicted believers; and these, by their presence, their faith and their prayers prove to be a protection even to the unrighteous; comp. Gen. 18 : 26.

VERSES 23 and 24. Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here *is* Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if *it were* possible, they shall deceive the very elect.

A. **Then** = during the period described in the foregoing words. —The writings of the apostles, Acts 20 : 29, 30; Rom. 16 : 18; 2 Cor. 11 : 13; Gal. 2 : 4; 2 Pet. 2 : 1; 1 John 4 : 1, and the history of primitive Christianity, show that few dangers were more insidious and formidable than those with which false teachers and religious pretenders of all kinds threatened the Church, after the day of Pentecost. The Lord had uttered warnings at the commencement of his ministry, 7 : 15; he repeats them above, v. 11, and here specially refers to those impostors who shall assume the name of Christ=Messiah; see above, v. 5.—B. **great signs and wonders.** Josephus remarks that before the fall of the city there was a "body of wicked men, not so impure in their actions, but more wicked in their intentions—who deceived and deluded the people under pretence of divine inspiration &c." *War*, 2, 13, 4. "They pretended that they would exhibit manifest wonders and signs," *Ant.* 20, 8, 6. The prophecy of the Saviour and the history of the Jewish historian precisely agree. The signs and wonders which these false Christs and prophets promised or pretended to perform, were "lying wonders," such as Paul mentions, 2 Thess. 2 : 9, and, like every ungodly thing, were "after the working of Satan."—C. **if it were possible**; the original phrase is simply: "*if possible*," and does not deny the possibility of the fall of the elect, (mentioned also in v. 22) as the English version seems to do by the unnecessary insertion of the italicised words *it were*. Precisely the same two Greek words occur in ch. 26 : 39; Acts 20 : 16; Rom. 12 : 18 and Gal. 4 : 15; in the first three passages a possibility *may* exist, in the last it is, for the sake of argument, assumed to exist. While the word *if* frequently introduces a *doubt*, it also frequently indicates that a particular circumstance may easily occur or really does exists, as in 5 : 29; 6 : 30; 7 : 11; 12 : 28. Accordingly the Lord here by no means teaches that the "elect" or

any human beings are infallible or incapable of being deceived, or of falling, and that hence they no longer needed the prayer: *Lead us not into temptation;* Ezek. 18 : 24, Mt. 26 : 41; 1 Cor. 10 : 12, Phil. 3 : 12. The sense of the words is very clearly given by one of the four to whom these words were spoken (PREL. OBS. F. § 4.) He addresses, (2 Pet. 1 : 1, comp. with 1 Pet. 1 : 1) those who had obtained a "like precious faith" with him, that is, the elect, in the following manner: "Ye, therefore—beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness" 2 Pet. 3 : 17. "Give diligence to make your calling and election *sure*," 2 Pet. 1 : 10. The Lord's word: "What I say unto you, I say unto all, WATCH," Mark 13 : 37, is said to each individual until his race on earth is fully run.

VERSE 25. Behold, I have told you before.

**Behold—before** =so that when all shall come to pass, your faith may not waver, but rather be confirmed by such evidence of my divine foreknowledge, John 13 : 19; 14 : 29

VERSE 26. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, *he is* in the secret chambers; believe *it* not.

A. **Wherefore** =as the lesson to be deduced from these warnings, if they &c.—B. **if they** =indefinitely, any agents or blind adherents of these impostors.—C. **Behold, he** (= Christ, in v. 23) **is &c.** Some of the impostors and false Christs would secure a retreat in the desert, and thither call their deluded followers; others who still abode in the city before its fall, would either affect a mysterious air, or conceal their pretensions from the public view, and secretly gather disciples (="*secret chambers*," a term indicating privacy, mystery; for the word see 6 : 6 B.)—Whatever character the impostor might assume, he was not *the Christ* whom the disciples knew, and must be instantly and unhesitatingly disowned.

VERSE 27. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

A. **For as &c.** After the Lord had reached this point, and given the signs indicating the near approach of the destruction of the city, he again refers to the questions in v. 3, which seemed to imply that his last coming at the end of the world would occur at the same time. Mark omits here a por-

tion of the Lord's words; the conversation is probably resumed, and Matth. in v. 27–31 gives the substance of the Lord's replies to the disciples. Christ *now* shows that the end of the world would be introduced by signs, and attended by circumstances of a character totally different from those which he had just described in v. 15–26. As these events still belong to the future, and we have no other precise and definite revelations of them, they, like all unfulfilled prophecies are so veiled that no interpreter can furnish a full and particular explanation.——"For"; this word generally introduces a reason which is given for something previouly said. We may suppose either that words like those in v. 5, "the end (of the world) is not yet," had been repeated, or that the Lord had said that new and peculiar signs would announce his coming, which he now proceeds to describe; "for" continued he, "as the lightning &c."—B. as the lightning &c. Two features of the lightning are here indicated, fisrt, its celerity, suddenness or unexpectedness, (whence it is frequently used as an image of unlooked for events) and, secondly, its conspicuousness, distinctness, or the widely extended space in which it is seen ("east---unto the west," as in Job 37 : 37), on which account it is at once distinguished by all from any other luminous appearance.—So shall &c. =so, too, when I, the Son of man, 8 : 20 B, shall come the second time, 10 : 23 B, to judge the world, that event will be both unexpected ("as a thief in the night" 2 Pet. 3 : 10, and v. 43 blow), and also will be marked by such divine glory, 2 Thess. 1 : 7, 8, that all the world ("east--west") shall be able to distinguish it unerringly from the appearance of any pretender or false Christ; Rev. 1 : 7. Comp. Luke 17 : 24, and see Prel. Obs. G.

Verse 28. For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

A. For &c. =For, as the well known proverb indicates the inevitable result of certain operating causes (the carcass inevitably attracting the bird of prey that is still unseen), so the confusion in the world, the sins of men, the interposition of divine grace, and the whole course of human events from the fall of Adam to the preaching of the Gospel for a witness unto all nations v. 14, necessarily call for an ultimate divine adjustment, a retribution, a divinely arranged new order of things. Comp. Rom. 2 : 5–10; 2 Thess. 1 : 6–10, Rev. 21 : 1, 5. The proverb, which was not unknown to other ancient

nations, was current among the Jews, and is found in substance in Job 39 : 30: "where the slain are, there is she (the eagle);" see 7 : 6 A; the same image is introduced in Deut. 28 : 49. The original name, however, and particularly the corresponding Hebrew word, embraces also, in a broader acceptation than the modern word, a species of vulture (*Vultur percnopterus*), in some respects resembling the eagle; it has part of the head denuded of feathers, to which feature there is an evident allusion in Micah 1 : 16, where the name is translated *eagle*, as well as in Job 9 : 26, Hos. 8 : 1, Hab. 1 : 8; in all these cases the allusion doubtless is to a vulture. The latter prefers carrion ("carcass"), while the eagle, as it is well known, prefers to seize its prey alive. Besides, while vultures were numerous in Palestine, the eagle was rarely seen. The text cannot, therefore, refer, as some suppose, to the Roman eagles described above, v. 15 B., (Jerusalem or Judea being the carcass); still less, as others believe, can the eagles be images of destroying angels (the carcass representing the spiritually dead); least of all can they, as different interpreters have assumed, represent the assembly of believers surrounding the crucified and risen Redeemer as the carcass. Oriental travellers have observed that a carcass sometimes lies undisturbed for a season, and that nevertheless in a very brief space of time, vultures which have perceived it at an immense distance dart in large numbers suddenly from the air upon it. The sense then is: As a carcass will inevitably attract vultures, although none may yet be visible, so the mixture of good and evil in the world will surely lead to a divine interposition ultimately, even though men in their false security may entertain no apprehensions, 2 Pet. 3 : 3, 4. The Son of Man will, namely, come and judge the whole race, whose habitation, the earth, will then pass away. The same words occur in Luke 17 : 37.

VERSE 29¶. Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken.

A **Immediately—days.** The remark made above, v. 27 A. that no interpretation of these prophecies can possibly furnish details beyond the words of the text, applies here with peculiar force. "Those days" embrace the period preceding the Lord's coming to judgment and indicate a certain duration of time, which seems to be implied in 1 Cor. 15 : 23, 24 also. During this period intervening between the first indi-

cations of the Lord's coming, and the actual advent, "*tribulation*," (for which word see above 13 : 20, 21) will be endured, but this transition-period will not be of long continuance ("immediately after"); with this interpretation the words "in those days" Mark 13 : 24 fully concur.—The pause which is usually made here by interpreters does not appear to be sustained by any valid argument. The Greek words for "immediately after," which cannot possibly admit of any essentially different translation, necessarily imply a very brief interval, and cannot comprehend the many centuries intervening between the fall of the city and the end of the world; hence the events of this verse are very closely connected with the foregoing in v. 27, 28. If in the present verse the last coming of the Lord is meant, that event must also be meant in v. 27.—B. the sun be - - - from heaven. Similar language occurs frequently in the Old Test. as in Isa. 13 : 10 ; 34 : 4; Ezek. 32 : 7 ; Joel 2 : 30 ; Hag. 2 ; 6, referring to great and striking events, many of which are more or less intimately connected with Gospel times. Here, however, there is a distinct reference to great and visible changes in the appearance of the heavenly bodies, which may possibly be the beginning of that dissolution of all things revealed in 2 Pet. 3 : 10, 11. As in v. 7, so the words here employed, are not mere figures of speech, but are to be literally understood.—"stars shall fall;" it is not here said that they shall fall on the earth; they shall *fail*, *pass away*, as the original words found here and in Mark 13 : 25 are rendered in Luke 16 : 17; 1 Cor. 13 : 8.—C. and the powers - - shaken. As these "powers" are here distinguished from the sun, moon and stars (sometimes called the host of heaven, Ps. 33 : 6; Isai. 34 : 4) they possibly refer to the intelligent heavenly "hosts," the angels, 1 Kings 22 : 19, Ps. 103 : 21; 148 : 2, who appear to be the "powers" mentioned in Rom. 8 : 38 ; 1 Pet. 3 : 22, and are called "angels of power" in 2 Thess. 1 : 7 in the original.—They are "shaken" =*roused*, deeply interested in the solemn scenes, without the accompanying "trouble" of the Thessalonians, 2 Thess. 2 : 2; the word originally describes the oscillating movements of a vessel occasioned by the action of the waves. The angels had previously been interested in the divine plan of salvation, 1 Pet. 1 : 12, and rejoiced when they perceived its saving influences on the sinner, Luke 15 : 10; they are, moreover, themselves actively employed in these solemn scenes, v. 31.

VERSE 30. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

A. **And then**; the length of the several divisions of time here respectively specified, is not revealed, v. 14 F.—B. **the sign of the Son of man.** The nature of this sign the Lord has not described; it is sufficient for us to know that when it shall appear, it will be so distinct and intelligible, that none can mistake its meaning, like the manger, Luke 2 : 12, and the star Matth. 2 : 2, 7, 9 on previous occasions. It may consist in the whole character of these events, their suddenness, grandeur, visible and direct heavenly origin, as Luke 21 : 25 seems to imply; it may be a celestial light, like that which "suddenly shined round about" Paul on the road to Damascus, Acts 9 : 3, and which will be the more distinct in consequence of the prevailing darkness, v. 29; or, in reference to Dan. 7 : 13, and the repeated introduction of the remarkable name: Son of man, (see above, v. 27 B), the sign may consist in the new appearance of the God-Man, Jesus Christ, in his human nature, yet invested with all divine glory.—C. **and then---mourn**; comp. Zech. 12 : 10–12; Rev. 1 : 7. At that time men will be found in all parts of the world, who will either mourn as penitent sinners, or mourn that they did not "obey the gospel," and now are to be "punished &c.," 2 Thess. 1 : 8, 9.—"**mourn**"=**bewail**; the same word occurs in 11 : 17.—D. **and they shall see--glory**=all shall have abundant evidence of the presence and power of the Judge, Dan. 7 : 13. The "clouds" are doubtless like the "bright cloud" mentioned 17 : 5, to be understood as brilliant masses of celestial light; comp. Acts 1 : 11; Exod. 16 : 10. The "*power and great glory*" of the Son of man will be demonstrated first by the attendance and adoration of "his mighty angels" 2 Thess. 1 : 7, who, while they "excel in strength" (Ps. 103 : 20, 21) declare by their prompt obedience the greatness of HIM, to do whose pleasure is the great purpose of their existence; and secondly, by his wonderful works, the raising of the dead, John 5 : 25, &c.

VERSE 31. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the one end of heaven to the other.

A. **And he—angels.** See 13 : 38 C. When the Lord afterwards, 25 : 31, at the conclusion of the discourse, resumes

the subject of the general judgment, the presence of the angels is again mentioned.—B. **with—trumpet.** When God came down upon mount Sinai, one of the wonders that announced his presence consisted in sounds like "the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud," Exod. 19 : 16. Similar voices, loud as trumpets ("*sound*," lit. *voice*) will not only proclaim the presence of the Judge, but also announce the actual resurrection of the dead, according to revelations given after these words of Christ had been spoken, in 1 Cor. 15 : 52; 1 Thess. 4 : 16.—C. **and they shall gather the elect**; for the *elect* see above, 20 : 16 B. "The dead in Christ"—they that are Christ's—"shall rise first," 1 Cor. 15 : 23, 1 Thess. 4 : 16, and then also "they that have done evil," John 5 : 29.—D. **from the four---the other**; see Mark 13 : 27 and comp. Deut. 4 : 32; 13 : 7; 1 Chron. 9 : 24; Rev. 7 : 1; all the terms in these passages are equivalent to the phrase: "all parts of the earth," or "from every direction," from every point of the compass. The language, as in Deut. 30 : 4; 2 Sam. 22 : 8, is suggested by the appearance in nature, according to which the sky (heaven) seems at a vast distance from the spectator, or at the horizon, or boundary of vision, to rest on the earth, at a point where the "ends" of both seem to meet.

VERSE 32. Now learn a parable of the fig-tree; When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer *is* nigh.

A. **Now learn &c.** The word translated "*Now*," is simply the connective often rendered *And* or *But*, as in v. 19, 36, or altogether omitted as in v. 29 at the beginning. The Lord here makes a pause in his discourse; this pause is distinctly marked in Luke 21 : 29, where a new division of the prolonged discourse is announced by the words: "And he spake to them a parable." The Lord had probably been interrupted by an exclamation or question of the disciples; he answers by reminding them that they have now sufficiently full revelations of the two events which so deeply interested them, and that he expects them to meditate, and by watching the course of Providence to "know"=to discern "of their own selves" Luke 21 : 30, the respective signs of the times, 16 : 3.—B. **a parable**, see APP. art. PARABLE. The sense is:—The illustration of these things is furnished by the fig-tree; as the changes in nature are an indication of the seasons, so these changes in the course of events, will be sufficiently clear indications of the downfall of the city.—C.

branch--tender=when the sap has risen, and the branch, after being dry and rigid in the winter, becomes moist and soft; for "*fig-tree*" see 21 : 19 A.—D. summer=here, time of wheat harvest, for which important event preparations were made when the leaves of the fig-tree began to appear. Comp. Prov. 6 : 8, where summer and harvest are viewed as nearly coincident.

VERSE 33. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, *even* at the doors.

A. **all these things**=the signs of the approaching fall of the city, as already described v. 4–13, and 16–26.—B. **it is near.** *What* is near? The parallel passage Luke 21 : 31 contains the answer; "the kingdom of God." This phrase (for which see APP. *art.* KINGDOM,) indicates fundamentally a communion with God, a more or less perfect recognition of his glory by his creatures. Now the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple exercised an incalculably great influence not only on the spirit and character of the Christian Church, but also on its external growth or expansion. All the bonds that had hitherto connected believing Jews with the ancient religion (visits to the temple, observance of Jewish ceremonies &c. Acts ch. 15; 18 : 18; 21 : 21–26) were dissolved when the temple service, with its sacrifices &c. ceased, and this awful evidence of the divine rejection of those who had slain the Lord Jesus had been given. The Church of Christ emerged from the ruin of the nation as an independent and new organization, with a life, a power and a spirit of its own, and with a worship and a law totally distinct from those of the old religion. Then, as never before, the prophetic words of the Saviour addressed to the Samaritan woman, John 4 : 21–24, began to be fulfilled, and a more widely extended development or manifestation of the spirit of the Christian Church as distinct from Judaism, together with more freedom in its movements, commenced. In such a sense, the fall of Jerusalem was an impressive token or sign that the manifestation of "the kingdom of God," in its proper Christian form was "*near, even at the door*;" the latter phrase indicates the very closest proximity, James 5 : 9. Hence, as the fig-leaves announced the gathering of the grain, so the fall of the city announced a gathering of people, a harvest for the church, among Jews and Gentiles, immeasurably greater than any accessions which it had previously received.—Of the history of the Church during the period in question, extending from

A. D. 70, when Jerusalem fell, to A. D. 100, the notices still in our possession are very scanty; one well known fact, however, sheds a flood of light upon it. Pliny, the governor of Bithynia and Pontus (Acts 16 : 7; 1 Pet. 1 : 1) wrote a letter to the emperor Trajan in A. D. 107, about 37 years after the fall of the city, which presents the following facts: In that remote region, on the south of the Black Sea, nearly the whole population had been converted to Christianity, the heathen temples had been almost forsaken, the Pagan religious rites had generally ceased, &c. The facts show that a powerful impulse to the growth of the Church was given by the great catastrophe to which the Lord here refers.

VERSE 34 Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.

**This generation &c.** See above, 23 : 35 B. The word here, like the corresponding Hebrew term in Numb. 32 : 13 evidently refers to persons then living, contemporaries, as above, 11 : 16; 12 : 39; 16 : 4, and in Acts 2 : 40; 13 : 36; Hebr. 3 : 10; *contemporaneous* existence is meant in such cases. A *generation* was reckoned, after the era of Moses at 30 or 40 years, see Deut. 1 : 35; 2 : 14. The destruction of Jerusalem occurred nearly 40 years after these words had been spoken.—"all these things," as in v. 6 above=that are mentioned as signs of the approaching fall of the city.—"pass," see 5 : 18 C.

VERSE 35. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.

**Heaven &c.** To this event—the passing away of the present visible creation—mentioned in Ps. 102 : 25, 26; Isai. 51 : 6, the Lord had already prophetically alluded in 5 : 18. The sense here is:—You cannot rely on the stability of any visible object, for all that you behold above or around you is transitory; but my words shall not come to naught; they are reliable=on their fulfilment you can rely.—This is language which no *creature* could presume to employ ("*my* words"); it is here uttered by God the Son.

VERSE 36¶. But of that day and hour knoweth no *man*, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.

A. When the conversation of the four disciples and Christ had reached this point, the former appear to have refrained from further interruptions of his discourse. As in Mark 9 : 32, Luke 9 : 45, the disciples, although perplexed and dis-

tressed by certain mysterious words of the Lord which they long could not understand Luke 18 : 34, nevertheless "feared to ask" for more precise explanations, so here too, they appear to be troubled in spirit, but do not venture to interpose new questions. This new division in the discourse is distinctly seen both in Mark, ch. 13 : 32, who here, after adding a short summary discontinues his report, and in Luke, ch. 21 : 33, who adopts the same course; both leave to Matth. the task of reporting in full the discourse from this point.—The Lord proceeds apparently to speak uninterruptedly to the close of the next chapter, on a new subject, namely the personal application of the great truths which he had so far revealed. He designs to give a practical character to his predictions by introducing the following solemn lessson:—While the events already foretold are in themselves of vast importance, yet in the case of each individual, whether he dies in one century or in another, the hour of his death, after which he can no longer work out his salvation, Phil. 2 : 12, is really equivalent to the coming of the Son of Man to judgment, inasmuch as his own future and eternal lot is at that moment virtually decided. This impressive doctrine is unfolded in v. 36–41, and then affectingly illustrated and applied in the remaining portion of the discourse.—B. **But of that day and hour.** See above, PREL. OBS. D.—The Lord, well understanding the anxious looks of his disciples, nevertheless absolutely withholds from them the knowledge of the precise time ("day and hour") of the actual end of the world. His words, which may be translated: *Concerning* THAT *day and hour*, *however*, &c. and pointing back to v. 30, clearly show that we have here a transition to another subject entirely distinct from "these things" which that generation will live to see, v. 34. *That day*, as in 7 : 22, and 2 Tim. 1 : 12, 18; 4 : 8, is the "day of the Lord" mentioned in 2 Pet. 3 : 10; 1 Thess. 5 : 2.—So, frequently the words *that*, *those*, used, as here, in opposition to *this*, *these*, refer to a more remote subject previously mentioned; in Luke 18 : 14 *that one* (translated *the other*) is the Pharisee mentioned in a former verse. In Mark 16 : 20 *those* (translated *they*) are the disciples mentioned in a foregoing verse.—C. **knoweth no man &c.** =it is not a subject which a creature ought to know or can endure to know; comp. Acts. 1 : 7.

VERSE 37. But as the days of Noe *were*, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

But as the days &c. = As men in the days of Noah, when he proclaimed the approaching judgment, 2 Pet. 2 : 5, despised the divine warning, and paid no attention to the revelation of the precise time when the deluge would occur (in 120 years, Gen. 6 : 3), so, even if the Lord would reveal the precise time of the end of the world ("the coming" &c. v. 27), such a revelation would again be utterly slighted by the thoughtless and profane. If the time of that event should be revealed as more remote than the probable death of the individual, the revelation would only harden his heart the more and confirm his security in sin. The Lord here prepares the way for developing in v. 42 and the remainder of the discourse the lesson already mentioned in v. 36 A.—"Noe," the Greek form of the Hebrew name *Noah*.—Comp. Luke 17 : 26, and PREL. OBS. G.

VERSE 38. For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark.

For as &c. See Gen. 6 : 1–5, "the wickedness of man was great." "Flood" = of waters, Gen. 6 : 17; 7 : 6, the deluge as in 2 Pet. 2 : 5. "Giving in marriage," as in 1 Cor. 7 : 38, spoken of parents who arrange the marriage of the children. "Until the day" = showing not the least regard to the divine revelation of the time of the deluge.—The Lord, as in his description of the rich man, Luke 16 : 19, specifies no gross crimes, as murder, &c., but his description represents these antediluvians as totally alienated from the life of God, Eph. 4 : 18, neither glorifying nor thanking God, Rom. 1 : 21, and ultimately abandoned by divine grace in consequence of their inexcusable ignorance and wickedness, Rom. 1 : 20, 24, 26, 28. Hence their worldly life, not being influenced by divine grace, exhibited nothing but vice and iniquity; comp. Rom. 1 : 29 ff.; 2 : 10–18; 14 : 23. The description is that of a godless and therefore a wicked generation, living in thoughtless security.

VERSE 39. And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

A. And knew not = did not reflect, regard, consider or care for the divine word, as, in Gen. 39 : 6, Isai. 1 : 3, the corresponding Hebrew word is to be understood, and the same Greek word in John 10 : 14.—. took—away = carried them off, caused their death; the Greek word, translated as an exclamation, "away," occurs in Luke 23 : 18; Acts 21 : 36;

22 : 22.—C. so shall &c. =so, too, at the end of the world, many will be totally unprepared to meet their Judge.

VERSES 40, 41. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two *women shall be* grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

The Lord in these two verses reveals the circumstance that when the time of his coming is at hand, the people of the world will be found absorbed by temporal concerns and totally regardless of their eternal interests, while others in similar stations in life, without neglecting their earthly calling, will be found to have lived a life of faith. He selects illustrations which comprehend both sexes and various conditions. Two men may be engaged in agricultural labors; one of them may be a believer; he will be "taken"=received into the care of the angels, v. 31, (comp. "take" in 2 : 20; Acts 21 : 24.) Two females may be intimately associated in the same household duties (for "grinding &c." see 18 : 6 C); one of these may be "taken"=be a true believer, the other, a worldly-minded female, be unfit, through want of a new heart, to be admitted into the joy of the Lord; comp. Luke 17 : 28, 32, 35, Lot, and Lot's wife.

VERSE 42¶. Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come.

A. The subject which the Lord has now introduced, that is, the duty of each individual to prepare for his approaching death, as if the day of that event actually coincided with the day of the Lord's coming, he proceeds to unfold to ch. 25 : 30. He primarily applies the lesson to his own disciples, as the first heralds of the cross and teachers of the Church.—That a new division of the discourse here commences, is shown by the manner in which Luke in ch. 21 : 36 (with which comp. Mark 13 : 33–37) here closes his report entirely; he indicates that the special subject hitherto discussed, is now changed for a new one. Comp. for this and the following verses Luke 12 : 37–40 and PREL. OBS. G.—B. Watch =in view of the uncertainty of the hour in which death may call you away; be always prepared to meet your Judge; watch for his coming, as if it might occur at any moment. "And what I say unto you, I say unto all, watch," Mark 13 : 37. "Watch and pray," Matth. 26 : 41. Comp. 1 Cor. 16 : 13, 1 Thess. 5 : 6; 1 Pet. 5 : 8, where the same word is translated: *be vigilant*.—"therefore"=for the reasons already adduced.—C. for ye - - - come = precisely your ignorance of

the exact time of your end is to have the effect of keeping your faith alive, of maintaining the spirit of prayer, of animating you to live near to God. Such daily communion with God, 1 Cor. 15 : 31, Gal. 2 : 20, alone can preserve you from Satan's snares and qualify you for the enjoyment of the presence of God in heaven.

VERSE 43. But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up.

A. **good man—house** = householder, see 20 : 11 B.—B. **in what watch the thief would come.** "Watch" = night-watch, 14 : 25 A., here equivalent to: *at what hour in the night.*—*The thief's arrival* was a familiar proverbial expression of the Jews, indicating any event the time of the occurrence of which was very uncertain; see above, 7 : 6 A; 18 : 3 C. The sense is: A wise man who receives an intimation that danger is approaching, will prepare for it, and be found ready when it arrives.—"**Broken up**" = *broken into*, entered through an opening in the wall, 6 : 19 B.

VERSE 44. Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh.

A. **Therefore** = in view of such an example, the excellence of which all admit, and which is adapted to your case; for while the arrival of death, on the one hand, is certain, the precise time, on the other, is uncertain.—B. **be--ready.** The original word for *ready* is equivalent to *prepared*, 22 : 4, 8; 2 Cor. 9 : 5, and as in 25 : 10 and Tit. 3 : 1; 1 Pet. 3 : 15, describes persons who have made all proper arrangements for an approaching event. The sense is: Hold yourselves prepared at all times for the decisive hour.—C. **for in such--cometh.** While it is obvious, on the one hand, that the disciples died before the second or last coming of Christ, it is equally obvious, in view of the succeeding words and the parables which immediately follow, that the "coming" which he here announces is a decisive and final event in the case of the disciples; comp. 25 : 10; it is the day of "reckoning" for them, 25 : 19, comp. with 24 : 46, 51. This coming can therefore not be the destruction of Jerusalem, with which the death of the several disciples did not coincide, nor any other striking public event; it can only indicate their own death respectively, inasmuch as, in one sense of the proverb founded on Eccl. 11 : 3, "as the tree falls, so it lies," the future and eternal state of each individual will depend on the life

and spirit which characterized him at the time when he died, see v. 36 A.—The Lord, therefore, here says: In place of inquiring with unnecessary anxiety concerning future events in which you are not personally interested, rather prepare for the hour of your own death; that hour may come suddenly, in some tumult raised by persecutors or otherwise. Therefore regard each day as your last, as if the end of the world were very nigh.

VERSE 45. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?

A. **Who then &c.** In this passage, v. 45–51, the Lord appears to allude specially to the apostolic duties of his disciples, or their responsible task of proclaiming the Gospel and founding the Church in every land. In their capacity as the original heralds of the cross ("pillars" Gal, 2 : 9, "the salt of the earth," "the light of the world," Matth. 5 : 13, 14, "sitting upon twelve thrones," 19 : 28) they assumed a heavy responsibility, and would, after their death, be subjected to a severe examination of the degree of fidelity which they had exhibited to their sublime mission. At the same time, the particulars mentioned in Mark 13 : 34 and 37, but omitted here ("to every man his work" &c.) show that every individual, in whatever position he may be, is regarded by the Lord as a responsible agent, who is solemnly bound to labor faithfully in the service of God. Matth. appears to regard the apostles particularly, without confining the application of the words to them alone.—"**Wise**"=here descriptive of a man of forethought and prudence.—"**Household**"=the aggregate of the "fellow-servants in v. 49. Comp. Luke 12 : 42.—B. **to give &c.** The servant here described as a model for the apostles, is a steward (a servant also, but invested by his master with authority over others, like Eliezer, Gen. 15 : 2; 23 : 2, and see 20 : 8 B.) Paul regards himself and his fellow-laborers as " stewards of the mysteries of God," 1 Cor. 4 : 1, and Peter assumes "every man that hath received the gift (*a* gift)" to be a "steward of the manifold grace of God," 1 Pet. 4 : 10.—"**Meat**"=food, 3 : 4 C.—"**in due season**"= at the proper time; in the spiritual sense, a wise or judicious as well as conscientious and zealous fulfilment of religious duty is here implied.

VERSE 46. Blessed *is* that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing.

**Blessed &c.** The blessings described in the Sermon on the Mount, 5 : 3–12, are here promised anew in all their fulness and eternal glory, and will be granted on the last day, 25 : 34; such precious promises, received in faith, cheered the disciples in all their subsequent trials, see 2 Cor. 4 : 17, 18, Phil. 1 : 21–23; 2 Tim. 4 : 6–8; James 1 : 12; 2 : 5; 1 Pet. 5 : 4, 10; 1 John 3 : 2; Jude 21.—"**so doing**"=always, without abatement, working, watching and praying.

VERSE 47. Verily, I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods.

A. **Verily &c.** As these remarkable words refer to acts of the Lord and to conditions of the redeemed, all of which belong to the future, and the scene of which is heaven, their precise meaning cannot now be known to mortals. St. Paul refers to the same subject in Rom. 8 : 17, 18, and calls the redeemed "joint-heirs with Christ;" he there also speaks of "the glory which shall be revealed in us," and elsewhere (2 Tim. 2 : 11, 12) declares that the faithful shall "live" and "reign" with Christ. As these visions of heavenly glory, if unveiled, would dazzle and overcome feeble mortals while they are in the flesh, St. John says: "it doth not yet appear &c.," 1 John 3 : 2.—B. **make him - - - his goods**; the sense of the image, taken from scenes like those in Gen. 39 : 4–6 is:—Even as such a lord advances the faithful servant to a position of the highest honor and enjoyment, so God will raise the redeemed to the full, unlimited enjoyment of heavenly glory and joy.

VERSE 48. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming.

**But and if**; the word *and* is here superfluous; it does not occur in the original Greek phrase, which elsewhere, as in 5 : 13; 6 : 23, is translated simply *but if*=*if however*, or, *should, however*.—B. **that evil servant**=if that highly trusted servant should be found to have been evil, faithless, dishonest.—C. **say in his heart**=secretly think, as in Ps. 10 : 6, 11, 13.—D. **My lord &c.**=the time of my death is still distant. "Though it tarry, wait (look) for it, &c. Hab. 2 : 3.

VERSE 49. And shall begin to smite *his* fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken.

**And shall begin &c.**=and shall walk after the flesh, Rom.

8 : 1, 1 Pet. 2 : 10, indulging the corrupt inclinations of his heart, and scorning all religious duties. The selfish, oppressive, carnally minded, Rom. 8 : 6, servant, is here the image of the nominal Christian, the unconverted, worldly minded, thoughtless sinner, James 4 : 17, and also of the hypocrite v. 51.

VERSE 50. The Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for *him*, and in an hour that he is not aware of.

**The lord---aware of**=he will harden his heart more and more, inasmuch as obstinate impenitence brings with it the curse of increased insensibility to the warnings of truth; thus the "day" and "hour" of death will come when he is least prepared to meet his God and Judge.

VERSE 51. And shall cut him asunder, and appoint *him* his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

A. **And shall--asunder.** This horrible mode of inflicting capital punishment, called Dichotomy, was practised by the ancient Babylonians, Dan. 2 : 5; 3 : 29, Egyptians and Persians; it differed from another barbarous mode of execution called *sawing asunder*, to which there is an allusion in Hebr. 11 : 37, where the prophet Isaiah, according to later traditions, is meant. Neither mode was tolerated by the laws of Moses. The acts described in 2 Sam. 4 : 12 and probably 12 : 31 were mutilations of the bodies of criminals after their death, the purpose of which was to add ignominy to the punishment of death. Under this image the Lord describes the eternal and awful doom of the impenitent.—"**Portion**"=fruit, reward, result, as in Eccl. 2 : 10; Rev. 21 : 8.—"**Hypocrites,**" see 6 : 2 D.; here the Lord reveals that their eternal condition in the other world will be one of unmitigated punishment and misery; they are in reality "unbelievers," Luke 12 : 46.—B. **there shall be—teeth**; see 8 : 12 D. "The wages of sin is death," Rom. 6 : 23.

---

TOPICS. CH. 24.

VER. 1. The presence of Christ in the Temple—The decay, ruin—of all the works of man. 2. The destruction of Jerusalem—history—causes which led to it—prophecies announcing it—lessons taught by it. Divine Judgment. 3. The common desire to know future events. The obscurity of

prophetic language—reasons. The end of the world—our interest in it. 4, 5. Self-deception in matters of religion. The signs of the true Messiah. 6. Wars—causes, continuance in the world in all ages—Christian duties in seasons of war. 7. National afflictions. 8. The light in which the Scriptures present the calamities of men. 9. The trials of believers—in all ages. 10. Wavering faith—unfaithful, false brethren. 11. False teachers. 12. The causes of the fall of believers—weakness of faith. 13. Perseverance—nature, difficulties, means, promises. 14. The future universal spread of the Gospel. 15. Devout meditation on prophecies and their fulfilment. 16–19. How far may the Christian lawfully provide for his security in seasons of danger—guided by what leading principles? 20. Prayer, of which earthly interests are the subjects. 21. Earthly sorrows—forms—different degrees of severity—universality. 22. Divine providence—the position of the believer in the world. 23, 24. Religious doubts—trials of faith—the duty and manner of seeking divine aid against spiritual dangers. 25. The believer, fore-warned and fore-armed. 26. True and false religion—how to discriminate. 27. The second coming of the Lord. 28. The certainty of a judgment—of future punishments &c. 29, 31. The scenes exhibited on the judgment-day. The decision is one for eternity. 32, 33. True and false indications of the end of the world—how to judge. 34, 35. The final dissolution of all things. The truth of the Saviour's words. 36. Why is the future concealed from our view? 37–41. Each individual responsible for his own conduct. The faith of one will not avail for another. 42. The uncertainty of the hour of death—the duty to be always prepared for it. 43. Impenitence inexcusable, as sufficient information, warnings &c. have been given. 44. No acceptable repentance possible after death. 45–51. The religious duties of different classes of men—of every individual. Our future account. The eternal punishment of the wicked.

# ARTICLE V.

## THE RACES OF MEN IN ENGLISH HISTORY:

By Henry Coppee, A. M., Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania.

The first subject of interest, which arrests our attention in the definition of History, is *Man.* Man, individual and social, is the great subject of History, but especially is it to man, as organized into races, that we would direct attention. After tracing briefly the great waves of migration, we shall endeavor to illustrate the subject, in this article, by a special consideration of the Races of Men in English History. In the investigation of our subject, we shall see the power of Race in settling certain localities, annihilating, absorbing, or mingling with the former inhabitants, altering the physical and moral nature of coming generations, re-forming the language, debasing the civilization which they find, or inducing a higher refinement, modifying or originating government;—in a word, impressing upon one type of man in history, the new and complex features of another, or of others in combination. Undoubtedly all these consequences are, in part, produced by the existence of other elements; climate, diet, in short, physical geography must enter into an extended consideration of the ethnic question, but the *Race* view is tangible and real and to this we now address ourselves.

If now we look at the Roman Empire, we shall find everything artificial; if at the Barbarians, who were to overthrow it, everything natural.

Without much examination we shall determine with regard to Rome, that her conquests were not conquests of Race in the simple acceptation of the term. If we inquire what are the elements of this colossal empire, by what law of national generation she could compass the world, we shall find it in one derivation of the name. Of her three names, the mysterious one was Ρώμη, Force; it was the force of a superior civilization and skill, and of many people, centralized by a geographic law upon the Tiber, which held together, without amalgamating, so many discordant ethnic elements. And we should expect that when some stronger force should exert itself to disunite, these parts would separate with a

rapidity and ease, for which the casual observer could not readily account.

This stronger force, which burst the bonds of Roman amalgamation, was the distinction of Races. Rome, a city, conquered everywhere, Etruria, Umbria, Latium, &c., confederations of cities, in which there was no new element of blood. Where there were no cities among her conquests, her example soon evoked them into being: to be a Roman citizen was the great boast of the individual; *liberty*, as opposed to *civic* bondage, was their happiest state. On the other hand, the barbarians had no cities; they were men of the wild wood and the mountain. There were no cities in Germany up to the time of Charlemagne. The fierce Teutonic races, as an offset to the *Civis Romanus*, the Roman citizen, called themselves Germans (spear men), brave men, all men, Goths, Guttones, or Gut (good) men. No pent up Utica contracted their powers; to rival the *liberty* of the Romans, they had *freedom*, the *freedom* of every man, not fettered by Augustus or Cæsar; they bowed to no king except in time of war, and possessed, in spirit and law, a boldness which was destined to evangelize humanity with that same identical individual freedom.

If we now consult a map of the movement of Races, we shall perceive that somewhere, not in any one spot, nor even in very definable limits of latitude and longitude, in Central Asia, there seems to have been a great historic *generatrix*, sending forth, at different intervals, and according to some law of migration westward, Races of Men, who moved, by a nomadic instinct, over that great double-highway which, forking at the Caspian, runs to the North and South of the Black Sea, and thus enters Europe by the sea coast of the Mediterranean, or by the passes of Sarmatia and Central Germany.

There was, indeed, an existent civilization before we have any record of these nomads; but this civilization was only the tribute of former nomads of whose journeyings no traces remain. A variety, it is supposed, of these very Kelts had swept from headland to headland in the Mediterranean, and peopled Greece with the Pelasgi; Italy, with Oscans and Etrurians, or the progenitors of both; France, with Gauls, Spain with Keltiberians, before the great accredited migration began. Indeed, long before the splendors of Rome could have attracted these Asiatic wanderers, and even before Rome existed, there moved successive waves of Race from Asia over Europe, peopling, re-peopling, uniting in part

with their predecessors, performing mighty deeds of valor, and energetic enterprises of government, of which no record, not even legendary, remains, but which philosophic analogy teaches.

Three great waves of migration, however, are well authenticated, of which two found their way into Britain. Each was broken, divided, stopped here and there in its movements, so as to constitute many minor divisions.

I. The first was the Keltic; the second the Scythian, or Teutonic; the third, the Sclavonian or Sarmatian. These are diversified by various geographic names. None of these, however, came at once and in compact form, like the charge of a well-drilled squadron of cavalry. They all came in partial and repeated surges, but each great division so distinct from the others as to justify the classification just made.

Thus for example, the Keltic wave was divided into many parts as it advanced, but of those the principal were the Keltic proper and the Kimmerian, of which the Keltic proper had reached Britain before we can trace its movements. And even of the Kimmerian we have only legendary accounts. It had already arrived at the Euxine in Asia Minor before history arose to scan its movements. Leaving these camping grounds, partly by the instinct of Western movement, and partly pressed forward by the coming Scythians, they wandered through and across Europe to France and the German ocean. They left stragglers on their route, as they passed, in Northern Italy, in France, in the promontory of Denmark, long afterward called the Kimbric Chersonesus; probably after the Scythians came. They crossed the narrow channel to Dover, and, with the first Kelts, peopled Britain. If we could trust the Welsh triads, these Kelts and Kimbri combined, or different surges of the first great wave, were the first tenants of Britain. With them came the great Brydain, from whom the country took its name; and before his coming, they say, "the only inhabitants were wolves, hyenas, bears and tigers;" a fancy which indeed might have been verified long after, for in later days, when Roman arms opened the way for Roman history, there were very few inhabitants, and two-thirds of the country was covered with forests of oak and gigantic pines, in which wandered wild animals and beasts of prey.

II. The identity of race is found by the traces of religion and secular customs. But before this first migration had expended itself upon the shores of the Atlantic, and the *Ulti-*

*ma Thule* of the North-Western sea, onward came the second, the great Scythian wave, from middle Asia, (σκυτοι) a magnificent race, destined to inundate Europe, and leave wherever it passed, the seeds and kelp of historic fertility. If we make an average between Homer and Herodotus, it was in the middle of the continent, about the seventh or eighth century before Christ. It drove forward or rolled over the Kimbri, and formed with it many tribes, neither exclusively Kelt or Scythian, as many of whom, as we have seen, had halted in their Westward career, between the lower Danube and the mouth of the Elbe. Sometimes its tribes stopped, well satisfied to occupy the conquered grounds; sometimes they mingled with the older race, making thus many petty tribes of various names. Thus in Central Germany, came the Tuderque or Teutonic races; for Teuton is the general appellation, in Europe, for both German and Scandinavian.—Wheaton's Hist. Nat. Thus in its more Northern movements came the Scandinavian race. So, too, the Gothic races sprung; in all of which the prevailing element was the Scythian; the term Goth being of generic value, as most of these Teutons were known to the Romans as Goths. It formed in the extremity of Denmark, the Jutes; in Sleswick, the Angles; in Hanover, and in the islands at the mouth of the Elbe, the Saxons.

On account of these strange freaks of the Scythian nomads, it is difficult to trace the direct origin of the little petty tribes of Germany; and it is, no doubt, due to these facts, that when Napoleon broke up the circles of Germany to form the Confederation of the Rhine, and a continental system, he found upwards of a thousand principalities, of which many were by no means equal, in extent, to the corporate limits of Philadelphia.

III. But the third wave was the Sclavonic. As we have no trace of it in England, we shall dismiss it in few words. Springing, doubtless from the same source, but inhabiting when first seen, the country between the Don, the Volga and Mt. Caucasus, it came, at a later period, over the same road, through what is now Russia, and what was Poland, with as wild and streaming a course as its predecessors, but it was suddenly arrested in mid-career; the way was stopped; there was no more room; the surges of the Kimmerian and Scythian tides were now slowly receding, and the Sclavonic migration found its movements in a Western direction, slow and painful. The fierce isolated races who came suddenly from

Asia, as the Alans and Huns, from the North, and the Tartary Turks, from the South, seem to have had for the purpose, the hurrying forward of events, and not to alter the justness of our general divisions. Nor can we here take cognizance of the Finns, those cold blooded fellows, who, although said to be of Teutonic origin, in their fur jackets, seemed to creep along the Arctic shores, afraid of the warmth and comforts of a milder latitude. Their great god, Iomala, was enshrined in a temple of ice and snow.

These, then, seem to be the simplest elements of European Ethnology. One great element of European *civilization*, seems to have had but little *ethnic* influence, and is therefore omitted from the present discussion; it will be recurred to hereafter; we mean the Phœnician. If they strike us as being vague and indefinite, they represent the true state of the case; the severest induction affords us no more satisfactory general results than these, and yet even with these, the student of history may accomplish wonders, by considering, 1st, their unity of origin; 2dly, when divided, their affinities; 3d, their inter-relation. As it would be impossible, in one article, to attempt to trace the detailed movements of these races in history, we can best explain the nature and philosophy of such an investigation, by considering their movements in Britain; and thus from the Britain of that day, deduce the England of this, or conversely analyze the England and the Englishman of to-day, into the element derived from the infringement and admixture of the great Scythian wave, represented by Jutes, Angles and Saxons, upon the Keltic, in the form of Kimmerian or Cambrians, Logrians and Britons.

It has been justly observed that the traces of Physical Geography, of Races of Men, of all history indeed, are much more easily removed from a plain than a hilly country. As floods or freshets of new people sweep the downs and alluvium of a country, they float up into the mountain fastnesses, and there fix the traces and particles of each deluge as it comes, just as the great natural deluge has left its indisputable testimony in the shells and sea-weed upon the loftiest mountain summits. Such is the case also in isolated valleys and islands.

Britain then, the Albion of Herodotus, the Prydhain of the Welsh triads, received the first surge of the Kimmerian wave, at a time and under circumstances obscurely hinted at in the

legends of poetic tradition, and though the eye of the student cannot pierce this gloom, yet in the mountains of Wales and Cornwall, in the highlands of Derbyshire, the Mercia of the Anglo-Saxons; in Scotland, among the Grampian fastnesses, are found relics of Kimbric speech, indeed the only relics that exist in our language. In Wales, in Ireland whither the Kelter wave passed and left almost pure Kelts, in Scotland, whence it passed from the North of Ireland, as well as through England, are found types of the Kimbric or Keltic race. The *gathering of the clans* was a Keltic custom, as *clan* is a Keltic word. *Cambria* is a modern spelling for *Kimbria*, the country of the *Kimri*, *Cumberland* is *Kimbri land*. *Caledonia*, *Kel-y-don*, means both Kelts of the mountains, and forests of the mountains, and is an apt etymology for "Scott's Kaledonia stern and wild." While the traditions of those glorious old heathen priests, in Gaul and Britain, the Druids, bards and ouates, glorious in their high morality, their great culture, their transcendent power, glorious in spite of human sacrifices and Pagan superstition, while their words and works have been almost entirely effaced in Essex, Sussex, Norfolk, Suffolk and Kent, the Welsh Mountains, the lake country, Cumberland and Westmoreland, the Grampian Highlands, with Mayo, Donegal, Clare, Kerry, indeed all Western Ireland, and even the sloping hills of Old Sarum, as they run down into Salisbury plain, echo to the language, the songs, the touching superstitions, the quaint traditions, of the vague and ghostly Kimmerians, who wandered, long ago, from the banks of the Euxine. It was an idea romantic and poetical for all its falsehood, and only false in his bright conceits, which Macpherson presented when under the name of Ossian, he forged a sounding, swelling poetry, as the lingering echo of the Gaelic or Keltic bards.

And now let us look at Britain under the occupancy of these Kelts and before the Saxons came. Of the inhabitants we may gather some few traits from the collated testimony of the Romans alone. Tertullian says, they stripped off their clothes when they marched upon the enemy, and presented, with pride, the great, naked and ill-shaped bodies, colored blue with woad and furrowed and scarred with strange tattooings. Their long hair waving as they advance, they moved forward in hostile array, to the songs of their bards.

Of Britain, before the conquest of Cæsar, we have only the vague accounts of Herodotus, Aristotle, Polybius and Strabo. It was mistaken for the *Cassiterides* or Tin Islands,

now known as Scilly Islands. Not a single written document remains, if, indeed, they had a written literature. The keenest antiquarian is at fault: it offers only conjecture, not even legend to the philosopher. The Roman conquest and occupancy of Britain, too, was but an episode. Although it lived 470 years, *i. e.*, from Julius Cæsar's discoveries, 60 B. C. until 410 A. D., it died and left no sign. Superior civilization, skill in war, better laws, rapidity in learning and acuteness in applying; these made the Romans, masters, but there was, as we have stated, no ethnic, no Race power in them to infuse into the Britons new life. They could, and did, bring into Britain the manners and morals, the fashions of Rome and the Provinces, but that was all. The Roman language seems only so much to have neutralized the Keltic without altering it, as to make it ready for annihilation by the Saxons.

Cæsar did not conquer Britain; he showed, by his two expeditions, his successors the way, and they soon discovered that Britain was a glorious strategic outport for military and naval purposes; soon began to give the lie to the poet who sang:

——*penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos.*

Roman conquests, on the Continent, in the East or in Africa, had been, in general, depopulations. Victorious generals made their raids, burning, effacing, annihilating, and then went back to Rome to bear, in indolent vice, the name of *Germanicus*, or *Africanus.* Claudius called himself and his infant son, *Brittanicus*, but simply for a so-called, not a real victory. Nay, sometimes the name was the cognomen of a future emperor. But in Britain it was far otherwise; on account of her distance and her military value, Britain was spared. It was to the interest of the Romans to tenant and civilize her for their own aggrandizement. The special strategic advantage of Britain to the Romans was this:—Sending one army directly from Rome against the Barbarians, between the Danube and the German Ocean, and thus driving them Northward, a Roman fleet fitted out in Britain, and landing anywhere on the coast, from the Rhine to the Elbe, could take them in the rear, and thus pen them in on both sides. While the strength of *Rome*, on the one hand, was a noble base of operations, the insular position of *Britain* made it an equally strong point *d'appui* on the North.

The result we have anticipated. Britain was built up,

beautified and adorned by the Roman masters, and instead of collections of huts, entrenched in the centres of pathless forests, which the Britons had inhabited, there now rose, as if by magic, cities like London and York, beautiful residences, and excellent roads. Thus, when the Romans gave it up, it was an enviable home.

But the Eternal City, sad misnomer! was gathering in her household; she was drawing back the Briarean arms to defend her heart. She had, says Montesquieu, conquered the world to give it up defenceless to the Barbarians. The Gothic torch was at her gate; the Gothic javelin was quivering in her side, and her power was paralyzed first at the extremities; and Britain, now deserted by Rome, was an inviting prey for any energetic and adventurous nation. Such a nation was the Saxons.

Thus, in few words we finish the episode of the Roman conquest; an episode it surely was; it left no ethnic trace; few marks remain to the antiquarian of the *Prima and Secunda, Cæsariensis, Maxima et Flavia:* and now when some monkbairns, and scores of such there are in England, would stand upon a fancied *prætorium*, and point out the fosse which marks the outline of a mighty encampment, he may well be stopped by any Edie Ochiltree, in a beggar's gaberdine, with the spell breaking words, "Prætorian here, Prætorian there; I mind the bigging o't."

We have said such an adventurous and energetic nation, as was ready to occupy the warm nest of the Romans in Britain, was the Saxon nation. A few rapid outlines must suffice to describe them. They were one of the tribes of the great Scythian wave, which had kept itself wonderfully distinct from the rest. In its wanderings Westward, it had stopped for a time on the confines of Asia Minor, and in Armenia was known as the *Sakai-Suna*, the sons of Sakai, and had enriched their vocabulary with many North Persian words, still retained in our language. It again took up its column of route, and at the beginning of Modern History, was settled in Hanover, Sleswick and Holstein, at the mouth of the Elbe and on the North Sea, and also on the little islands, not found without some trouble on our ordinary maps, Nordstrand, Busen and Heligoland. The last of these, Great Britain, in her prying character, as a sentry over other nations,—the Anglo-Saxon trait—has possessed herself of, and now owns.

Small in numbers, contracted in geographic limits, unher-

alded among the tribes moving Westward, this was the flower of the Teutons, a tribe with a very magnificent and manifest destiny. Immense in size, symmetrical in form, they were called by Salvian *Feri sed Casti*; but their wildness was energy, their chastity was nature. They would not intermarry because of degeneracy in their own, and superiority in other races.

Living thus at the North of the Continent, the Saxons, were just far enough off to escape the depopulation of Roman generals. The nations lying between them and the Danube, bore the brunt and masked them from danger. These nations had been conquered, and had revolted; had learned by slow degrees, the art of war from the Roman Legions, and were being prepared by this annealing, case-hardening of blood and fire, to take a terrible revenge in Gaul and Italy. Before they marched down, as the consolidated ranks, these German tribes had been able to pay Rome in her own coin. "The Germans," says Tacitus, "have captured or defeated five armies of the Republic, commanded by Consular generals, besides the fatal destruction of Varus and three legions, under Augustus Cæsar."

Exempt, however, from this schooling in adversity and in war, the Saxons had devoted themselves to the sea, and had been stealing Roman knowledge from the fleets in Britain and on their coast. But they were born sea-kings and vikings. With boats made of hides and fastened with osiers, they had dared the German Ocean; they had launched out in its darkest storms, and gloried in danger and death upon its waves. They had descended upon the British coast, in the time of Diocletian and Maximian, and had been driven back by Caurasius.

Notwithstanding our enlightened Christian views of national and individual morality, there is something unusally picturesque and romantic in the persons, characters and actions of these Scythian rovers; something which stirs the blood, in the boldness of their movements and the fury of their attacks.

Nomadic in their origin, they had started from distant Asia; they had reached the stormy Northern Sea; they had gone out into its islands to gaze upon the immeasurable deep. They could see nothing. Did they content themselves with seeing? No; quickly they make them barks of willow and cover them with hide, and launch furiously forth, now no longer nomads of the land, but nomads of the ocean.

Their immense forms of perfect symmetry stand erect, their yellow hair streams in the blast; their clear blue eyes reflect fiercely the lightnings of heaven; their loose linen vests, trimmed with many colors, flutter in the North wind, and are drenched with its blinding spray. No provision for the future; no! leave that for the spoils; only, in the bow and stern lie the long lances, the crooked knives and the small shields. They drive before the summer storm from the North-East. Ah! they reach a goodly land; into a hidden bay they suddenly shoot; and now sea-kings and berserkers are insane with true joy. Everywhere is seen flame; everywhere are heard shrieks and groans; everywhere flows bubbling blood; in their ecstasy of battle they catch it as it flows, and quaff its crimson wave, crying to one another, as they laugh, "Skoal to the North land, skoal!"

And are they now content? Yes; that land is Britain. It was that to which their ethnic instinct pointed, yonder in their early home, in Asia. It seems made for such a Race; they have found their goal; the principle of their existence, seems for a time paralyzed; nomads no longer, they have come, after their long wanderings in the wilderness, to a promised land of plenty, of progress, of coming civilization; a land in which they found wells which they digged not, and houses which they had not built.

This nomadic principle, thus checked and domesticated, was again to show itself in English adventure, exploration, commerce. It was the Saxon element, which was to have, in all time, "its march upon the mountain wave, its house upon the deep."

Such seems to be the philosophy of the Saxon occupancy of Britain. It is true, to come down to facts, that they had descended upon the British coast, while the Romans were there, and were driven back by Caurasius, in the time of Diocletian: it is also asserted as true, that, after the Romans left Britain, the deserted Britons sent a letter "to Œtius, thrice Consul, the Groans of the Britons." In it, speaking of their own Pictish and Scottish kinsmen, now, by contrast, a barbarous race, they say: "The Barbarians drive us to the sea; the sea drives us back to the Barbarians; between them we are exposed to two sorts of death—we are either slain or drowned." It is further asserted, but of doubtful truth, that as the Romans could not help them, they invited the Saxons to do so, and that the White-Horse banner landed in pride in Britain, under Hengist and Horsa, and drove back the Scot-

tish mountaineers to their highland fastnesses; and that afterwards, they liked the land so well, that they conquered the Britons to retain it.

These may, or may not be true. Philosophy does not need their evidence. It was a great Providential design. God had been, for four hundred and seventy years, using the Romans to prepare Britain for Saxon occupancy. The Romans were done with it; the Britons were helpless; the Saxons, like the Israelites of old, were ready for the promised land; and so they came. We need not pursue the story further. The Saxon Jutes made themselves masters of Kent; they conquered Wessex or West Saxony. Attracted by the success of their kinsmen, new hordes came to people Essex, or East Saxony: South Saxons settled in Sussex. Step by step the unfortunate British, of old Keltic blood, felt and receded from this the advancing wave of Scythian progress, until they reached the foot of the Western mountains. In Mercia, in Wales and in Cornwall, they fought the West Saxons with unavailing bravery. Hemmed in at the land's end, they crossed the channel, and uniting with their brethren in Gaul, founded Armorica or Brittany. Arthur, the son of Uther, "Begirt with British and Armoric Knights," in these furious conflicts, at the foot of the Welsh Hills, achieved his mysterious fame, and here met his fate, the type of Keltic fate in England, leaving to historic fiction a thousand scenes of legendary glory, and bequeathing to the glorious Keltic bards, to sing among the Welsh mountains, the hope of his miraculous return as a saviour and deliverer. His name and deeds struck the chords of every Keltic harp, and his advent, in glorious state, was the messiahship of the Pagan Britains. How often did the bards waken the Welsh to stirring deeds! Although history has chased away the fond delusion; although Arthur's sword is in foreign keeping; although the discovery and re-burial of his remains, in 1189, settles the question of his translation, yet again and again, has the Keltic song sent heroes to victory against the Saxons. It was Keltic fire which excited Owen Glendower, the Mortimers and the Tudors, to ransom their land from the minion of Henry IV, not with money, but with changing blows; which, in Ireland, received the exiled James II, with open arms, when Saxon England had spurned him from the throne, and would have him rule a Keltic kingdom in Erin. And when, at an earlier date, Edward I conquered Wales, he was wise, though cruel, if, as tradition tells us, he ordered all

the bards to be put to death, that they might not keep the people in furious rebellion, by their Keltic songs. If we may trust a modern poet, sore was the nation's lament:

> Cold is Cadwallo's tongue,
> That hush'd the stormy main:
> Brave Urien sleeps upon his craggy bed:
> Mountains, ye mourn in vain,
> Modred, whose magic song
> Made huge Plinlimmon bow his cloud-topt head.
>
> Hark, how each giant oak and desert cave,
> Sighs to the torrent's awful voice beneath!
> Vocal no more, since Cambria's fatal day,
> To high-born Hoel's harp, or soft Llewellen's lay.

The Saxon Jutes were followed by the Angles, their cousins, who left what Saxon writers call old England, in Denmark. They came first, in the year 527, and settled Deira, Bernicia and Northumberland; they also landed in Norfolk and Suffolk, which had been so called by Saxons, simply to distinguish the North folk and the South folk, but to which they gave the name of East Anglia. Then ensued a history of wars—Saxon and Angle wars, against the Britons; and wars between the Angles and Saxons for territory. But at length these coalesced, under the influence of the Bretwaldas, and then began that octarchy, which required one hundred and fifty years in forming, consisting, sometimes, of eight kingdoms, sometimes of five, and ranging between these two numbers, according to the issue of war. When it was an octarchy, it was comprised of one Jute, three Saxon and four Angle kingdoms. At length there was wealth and power and centralization enough in Wessex, to secure a claim to the whole, and somewhere between the reigns of Egbert and Athelstan, the king of the West Saxons, claimed to be king of Angle-land, or England. Of the nature of the sovereign's tenure, we may judge, however, from the fact that Alfred and Athelstan both signed themselves king of West Saxons.

And here we might almost end in outline, the subject of the Races of Men in English History. The *Danes* and the *Normans* were the same race, all included under the generic name of Scandinavians, or inhabitants of the triple kingdom of Denmark, Norway and Sweden—they were called Danes in England and Normans in France. Moreover, they were cousins, not far removed, of the Saxons, of the same great

Scythian family. But in order to complete the subject, involving, as it does, a change of dynasty, a change of language, and types of men different, although not dissimilar, we must look at the effect of the conquest of the Danes and that of the Normans in English History.

The Danes, taking advantage of the intestine feuds in Britain, and having yet all the instinct of rovers, which the Saxons had lost, came, in successive descents, upon the Western coast in East Anglia and Lindisse, and succeeded in gaining a partial foot-hold there; they also made incursions in the South. The story of the Danish rule, is a strange one. The Saxons, so long comparatively quiet, had become strangely paralyzed, and the Saxon kings, a strange feature, as we shall see in Saxon history, were singularly impotent. At length, coasting to the South of England, they came upon Southampton, and even to Devon and Cornwall. Fortune, or perhaps rumor, had favored them, for they found upon the throne, Ethelred, well named the Unready, who, when one vigorous movement would have overpowered the invaders, gave them costly presents, that they might leave him quietly to his luxurious vices. Between 988 and 994, £26,000 were paid by him, says the Saxon chronicle, to less than 10,000 Danes, for the ransom of England, with its millions of Saxons. Nor was his policy less cruel than cowardly, for when many Danes had gone back, in 1002, he sent secret letters into the towns where the remainder were domiciled, that at a given signal they should be massacred through the land. It was done. This Danish St. Bartholomew provoked a more furious and consequential invasion. The cowardly Dane Gelt rose to £36,000. The Saxon people were incensed, but they had no leader. William of Malmesbury, states the condition of England in few words: "A country illustrious and powerful; a king asleep, solicitous only about women and wine, and trembling at war, hated by his people and derided by strangers." Before the accession of Edmund Ironsides, the Danes had obtained sixteen counties, the Dane Gelt had reached £48,000, and Sweyn, a Danish chieftain, had reigned for one year. Then arose a singular contest; not of the people, but of great men. Edmund Ironsides was worthy the Saxon throne, but Knut (called Canute), Sweyn's Danish successor, was a mighty man in council and war. They saw each other's greatness, and compromised by dividing the Kingdom, the North to Knut, and the South to Ed-

mund. But when, in some mysterious way, Edmund was slain, Knut had no rival for the throne. To the greatness of Knut, the cowardice of Ethelred, and the factions of the English, is due the register of a Danish name on England's roll of kings. They were there but twenty-six years; the English nation spoke out in Saxon tones for a Saxon monarch, and he appeared in the person of Edward the Confessor. And yet, in their limited sphere, these Danes were bad men, and taught the Saxons much evil: from them they learned to distil and drink; from them and their wars, they established slavery: a man could sell his wife and children, and in some of the Danish parts of England, it only lately happened that a man disposed of his wife in the market place to the highest bidder, and a law, thought to be obsolete, protected him in his rights. It was evidently not a law for woman's rights.

But they were soon to be confronted by a sterner foe. These same Northmen, who had undergone a civilizing process, in Neustria, which they called Normandy, and who had long been influencing England, by priests, by fashions, by letters, by honied solicitations for the Crown, at length burst in fury upon England, and, at the fatal day of Hastings, passed the Saxons under a lasting yoke. And this, be it observed, was a dominion, not unlike the Roman dominion: it brought new laws; it infused the element of a new language; it inflicted continental monarchy and aristocracy; it *subjected* the people, but it did not, it could not, destroy them. All the great foundation features of the English people are Saxon; the forms are Norman: the flesh and blood is Saxon, the dress is Norman. The nation is Saxon; hereditary monarchy, calling the people subjects, (*subjecti*, thrown under), is Norman. That exclusive spirit of Norman aristocracy, which crossed the Channel with Willian the Bastard, is Norman still in its type and bearing. Whenever king or noble has been checked, and the people made freer, it was Saxon triumph. Thus, to some degree, have both monarch and nobles been Saxonized. Look at the Saxon elements, as they re-appear: "The ancient Saxons," says the venerable Bede, "have no king, but many chiefs set over the people, who, when war presses, draw lots equally, and whomsoever the chance points out, they all follow as a leader, and obey during the war: the war again concluded, the chiefs become of equal power."

Now, when they invaded Britain, they were in a state of

incessant war, so that a war-king, chosen by lot, would remain through a life time; then the simplest rule and pleasantest homage was found by placing the son of their deceased war-king on the throne; and thus, it will be at once seen, how easily a hereditary monarchy was fixed upon them; although, as history shows us, they continually deviated from this rule of primogeniture. The Saxon chiefs issuing from the bosom of the people, renowned only for warlike deeds, would, and did greatly limit the power of a monarch thus chosen from themselves: they placed themselves as kings on the thrones of the octarchy, deposed and restored the single monarch, without ceremony, when the fusion of kingdoms had taken place; they, as the true representatives of the people, upheld the Saxon power through the dark storm of Norman Conquest: it was their spirit which had possessed the barons when they wrested, in 1215, from the unworthy John, of the house of Anjou, the broadest charter of human liberty, which had then been engrossed for man. It will be said, but these were Norman barons who wrested Magna Charta from King John. Yes, but it was a people's charter: these Norman barons had become so Anglicised, that the immediate cause of their demand, was the fear of a new incursion of Angevius and Poitevius, or Normans, whom King John was about to call over to sustain, his licentious authority. The quarrel between Henry II, and Becket, was a war of *Race.* His penitence a submission to the Saxons, as well as to the Pope.

Time fails us to show how the Parliament of England, Norman only in name, is, instinct, the vitality of the Saxon Witenagemot, or assembly of the wise men. Up to the time of Edward III, there was but one House of Parliament, and it was, in many respects, the true representative of the Saxon legislature. The Saxon Witenagemot was convoked and addressed by the King: it consisted of Bishops, Abbots, Priests, Ealdermen, Duces, Earls and Thanes. Little by little the cities and burghs sent representatives. There was nothing Norman but form; everything, except the form, Saxon. The name parliament was Norman, or rather Latin, for it meant only a tattling ground, but how little it owes to the name, may be seen in the vast difference between the English and French Parliaments. It was the union of Norman law-forms to Saxon spirit, in the English Parliament that made it the truce ground of the two races; "where," says Bomechose, "their reconciliation was achieved and seal-

ed. The descendants of the Normans were willing to recognize there the old sovereign assembly of their barons; but it seemed to the sons of the old Saxons, the true heir, the legitimate successor of that council of sages, that Witenagemot, the name of which was inseparable from their great national recollections."

It must belong to another occasion, and another train of thought, to pursue this subject; to show how our laws and statutes are full of Norman phrases, or rather Romanized Gaelic phrases, and yet how Saxonized they have become in their spirit.

If from the laws we turn to the Language, we shall be astonished at the Saxon predominance. The structure is Saxon; the words, expressing great natural features, as sun, moon, earth, fire, spring, day, night, heat, cold, are Saxon; the words of dearest connection, mother, father, sister, brother, child, wife, are Saxon. The language of trade, market family; the cradle is Saxon; the grave is Saxon. Of the 38,000 English words, 25,000 are of Saxon origin. "Every speaker or writer," says Bosworth, "who would not only convince the uuderstanding, but touch the heart, must avoid Latinized expressions and adopt Anglo-Saxon. The difference is that of the winter's and summer's sun. The light of the former may be as clear and dazzling as that of the latter but the genial warmth is gone." A striking and a touching illustration of this may be cited.

When Mr. Bryant, our honored poet, was applied to for an autograph, to be inserted in the "Homes of American Authors," he sent one stanza of his beautiful lines *To the Past.* After speaking of the good and fair, the treasures and glories which have sunk into its abyss, he says:

> They have not perished, No!
> Kind words, remembered voices once so sweet,
> Smiles radiant long ago
> And features, the great soul's apparent seat;

then come the lines to which we refer:

> All shall *come back*, each tie
> Of pure affection shall be knit again;
> Alone shall evil die.
> And sorrow dwell a prisoner in thy reign.

He had written it *all shall return;* he had scored his pen through the Norman-Latin word, and had placed above it, *come back.* The heart-broken mother does not say to her erring son *return*, no! she says, *come back.* The mariner,

after appalling hardships and dangers, may *return* to port, but he *comes back* to the tears, the joy, the clinging embraces of a once despairing household.

What is the commerce of Great Britain, but the natural development of that spirit which launched the barks of the Saxon Jutes upon the storms of the North Sea, and which carried swarms of sea-kings and bay-kings to England, to Normandy, to Aquitaine; which, in search of more glorious Teutonic adventure, sent the Dane Gardar from Scandinavia to Shetland and from Shetland to Iceland; which carried Eric the Red to Greenland, and bore Leif the fortunate, with adventurous sail, to Labrador, New Foundland (Helluland), New England (Vinland) and our Southern coast, as White-Man's land, four centuries before the birth of Christopher Columbus. Southey was untrue to nature and to history when he conceived his Madoc. There was no Welsh intermedium between the Northmen and Columbus.

Even upon such a rapid and cursory view of the Races of Men in English History, how prominent does the Anglo-Saxon race appear. Its progress so uniform; its institutions so stable; if subverted for a few years, conquering their subverters and coming back unaltered to their old power and influence. Before its conquering march East and West, other Races so diminish and disappear, its types of language of person, of government, so re-produce and perpetuate themselves without degenerating, that the philosophic mind as far as it may seek, seeks in vain for the limits of its career or the bounds of its destiny.

Like the Israelites of old, may they not be chosen for some wonderful regeneration in history? The former were a people set apart to guard the types and prophecies until Christ should come; it would, indeed, seem that the latter are to be the special instrument, chosen by God, for the promulgation of that advent to the uttermost parts of the earth.

To almost every Pagan nation, Christianity came in fire and blood. We have not, indeed, authentic accounts of its first introduction into Britain under the Romans. Ancient chronicles written in cloisters, and eager to claim the honor of its introduction for some particular churches or orders, have gone so far as to assert that St. Peter and St. Paul were the great Apostles to Britain, and the converters of Britons, Kimbri and Germans, to the faith of Christ. Even when we are sure of its existence at the end of the second century, the date, assigned by tradition, of the conversion of

Lucius, a British king, we trace but a painful progress against the vast predominance of Paganism, and the Roman persecution, which occurred from 303–13, was, we are told by Bede and Gildas, as severe in Britain as on the Continent. It gave holy names to martyrdom, and sent, the year after the persecution ceased, the three chief bishops to the council of Arles. To Saxon Britain, Christianity came in peace and good-will. It found a nobler mythology than Greek or Roman. The Eddas and the Sagas, though wilder and vaguer, were more intellectual than the theology of Homer, Hesiod or Ovid. Christianity drove out the deities, indeed, lustrated the temples, and consecrated them afresh to the service of God. *Eostre* was baptized into *Easter*; *Yule* became *Christmas*; and thus with a pure faith, the English retain and have transmitted, harmless, customs which link them in holy bonds to their great, powerful and warlike Saxon progenitors.

Such was the Saxon power: to make it uniform and compact; to give it necessary forms, even at the expense of great oppression; to bind it to the Continent with bonds of steel; and to make these bonds always conduce to the advantage of England, was the mission of the Normans in history. The crusades, and their attendant circumstances, lifted the weight of the Norman conquest from England, and the elasticity of the Saxon soon made itself felt.

It was but a poet's fancy, and not a prophets ken, that permitted Robert of Gloucester to sing:

> The Folc of Normandie,
> That among us woneth yet, and shulleth ever mo,
> Of the Normans beth these hey-men that beth of this land
> And the low-men of Saxons.

The 60,000 companions of William the Conqueror, increased by occasional new-comers, left their names, indeed, in high stations in England. Norman patronymics lie more among the aristocracy and gentry than with the people; but literature, art, honest labor, expeditions to explore Africa or Asia, or, with a Saxon Franklin, although a nobleman, to die in polar ice and night; England's might and England's power are Saxon in origin, Saxon in name, Saxon in destiny.

And now let us recapitulate. We have mentioned the three great, independent, periodic waves of Asiatic migration, which peopled Europe and are peopling the world. We observed that distinct traces of them are found in mountain

countries. We presented the two, which had reached Britain, as unequal, and showed the Teutonic predominance.

Of the four conquests of the British Islands, we have demonstrated that the Saxon alone can claim to be a pure conquest of Race. The Roman was an episode, preparing Britain for the Saxons; the Danes were but a momentary check in the Saxon sway, productive of no lasting results; the Normans, like the Romans, a new preparation of form, method and circumstance, to give efficacy and power to Saxon influence throughout the world. And now, as we look back, we feel as though we had come only to the very threshhold of the subject, had named the title of the great chapter, and had said to our readers, Enter and learn for yourselves.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### BENEFICIARY EDUCATION.

The education of pious and indigent young men, for the ministry of the Gospel, is a subject of much importance, and has often engaged the serious consideration of the Church. The cause has attracted the sympathy and the benevolent action of Christians of every name, and through the blessing of God upon the efforts of its friends, faithful ministers of the Gospel and missionaries of the cross have been trained for usefulness in the Church, who, but for the fostering care of this institution, would have been compelled to turn aside from their holy aspirations, and to devote to secular pursuits the energies which they earnestly desired to employ in the glorious work of proclaiming to ruined man the unsearchable riches of redeeming grace. But the Education Society, although it has done much good, and been the means of giving to the ministry some of our most efficient and successful pastors, is not, in the judgment of many, fulfilling, according to its present constitution, its whole mission, and accomplishing the results, contemplated in its organization, or commensurate with the efforts employed and the means expended. There is a want of entire, cordial confidence, in the system of educating indigent young men for the Gospel ministry, as conducted at the present time. It has evidently de-

clined in the affections of the Church. The interests of the cause have certainly suffered. Some of its most ardent friends have become alienated and even rendered hostile. It has experienced a series of embarrassments; its operations have been, for some years, in a depressed condition, its action, often, isolated and inefficient, its influence for good impaired, and its usefulness greatly diminished. Too many men, incompetent for the work, have been introduced into the sacred office. Is there no way of reforming the evil; no plan which may relieve the difficulty and inspire the confidence of the Church? Cannot our past experience furnish some useful lessons, some profitable suggestions? The Church is most deeply interested in the supply of an intelligent and evangelical ministry; a free and full discussion of the whole subject, is, therefore, eminently proper, so that errors may be corrected, our views rectified, improvements adopted and the efficiency of the work promoted. The opinions here presented, have not been superficially formed. They are the result of a careful examination of the operations of the present system upon the beneficiary, the ministry and the Church.

Our position is, that a change is necessary in the fundamental principles of educating indigent young men for the Christian ministry. The great evil, we think, consists in the premature selection of candidates. Individuals should not be selected, while, as yet, they are not qualified, either by age, experience or attainments, to settle so important a question. Young men should not be encouraged, prematurely, to make choice of the ministry as their profession, without the opportunity of deliberately and solemnly examining the whole subject, and intelligently realizing the responsibility of the obligation they assume, or before the most ample reason is afforded that they are fitted for the duties, and likely to be successful workmen in the vineyard of the Lord. Acting under sudden impulses, there are always those ready to set out upon a course of preparation, who do not sufficiently count the cost, and, consequently, fail in the attainment of the object. Facts and traits of character are, as yet, undeveloped, and are, therefore, not known to the Church. Hence, expectations are often disappointed and reverses experienced in the history of Beneficiary Education. It is injudicious and unsafe to place under a solemn religious obligation, or to require, from all applicants for aid upon the funds of the Church, a pledge that they will, unless

physically prevented, necessarily enter upon the duties of the ministry, while the mind is immature and the character still in a formative process. We object to the present system for several reasons.

1. Its tendency is to introduce, into the ranks of the ministry, men who are evidently uncalled to the work, and totally unfit for the service, even in their own estimation, but who feel that they are bound to engage in its duties, only because this was the design of their education, and a solemn pledge was given, at the commencement of their *curriculum* of study, that they would labor in the sacred office. All good men are not called to the ministry of reconciliation. All Christians are endowed with talents, with which they can serve the Church in some useful capacity, but they are not necessarily qualified for the ministry, nor can they become so by any amount of intellectual training. Even though they possess sound judgment, and an aptitude for the acquisition of knowledge, it does not follow, as a matter of course, that they are called to the solemn and responsible work of preaching the Gospel. They may be deficient in certain qualifications which are essential for making them instructive, acceptable teachers, or efficient, influential, successful pastors. Before a young man begins his studies, or whilst he yet is in his preparatory, or even his collegiate course, can it be fully ascertained whether he will be found to possess these qualities or not? Is it not rather a question which can be determined only by time, after his character has become matured by experience, and his abilities tested by repeated trial? The wisest have frequently been disappointed in their expectations. The promises of spring are no sure index of the harvests of summer. Early indications are not always realized. The young man, who bade the fairest, has not always fulfilled the hopes which he, in his youth, excited, whilst he, who seemed most unpromising, and whose application, perhaps, was rejected, has, after entering the ministry, under the most formidable obstacles, proved a most efficient and valuable laborer, and the guide of many to glory. The responsibility, it is true, is often thrown upon the Committee, to whom the examination of candidates, for aid has been intrusted. They are censured for receiving, upon the sacred funds of the Church, those who are unworthy of confidence and do not turn out well. But with all their wisdom and fidelity, they must sometimes, necessarily, fail and com-

mit great blunders. They are not endowed with the skill to divine, with the apostolic gift of prophecy; and even if the standard of qualification, for reception on the funds, were raised, the evil would not be removed. They would still be embarrassed in their decision. Imperfection characterizes this, as it does every other department of labor. To judge of human character, is frequently a matter of great delicacy and difficulty, and the longer we live, and the more we have to do with forming an estimate of it, especially in the young, the greater necessity we find for caution, patience and kind indulgence. Not a few, who have honored the ministerial office, would certainly have been pressed back, if these summary rules had been applied, which some men would have us rigidly adopt. Many years ago a young man was almost repelled, on the ground that his talents did not justify his reception. He was, however, received, and afterwards occupied a high position in his Church. He succeeded in reducing a chaotic Pagan dialect into a written form, and in translating into the dialect the whole of the sacred Scriptures. The same is true in reference to the early history of one, whose successful career, in the Eastern hemisphere, was said to resemble, so much, that of the Lord, in giving sight to the blind. Many are brought into the Church, in seasons of religious excitement, when it is difficult to distinguish between genuine and spurious conversion; between those who are influenced by sympathy, and those who are really awakened by the Spirit of God. There is often reason to suppose that many such are under no special guidance of Divine truth. They enter the communion of the Church, and are, injudiciously, pressed to turn their attention to the ministry, before a fair opportunity has been given to them, or to others, to form a correct opinion of their religious character. The greater care is necessary, to guard against imposition, when a young man, in an obscure condition, offers himself as a candidate for the ministry. The prospect of emerging from a humble position, to one of influence and power, is as great a temptation as can well be presented to the youthful mind, and it is no difficult matter for his own heart to deceive him. He may, subsequently, discover his error and feel that he is an *incubus* to the successful prosecution of the work; yet if he forsake the ministry, from a dislike to its duties, or from a consciousness of moral unfitness for the faithful discharge of them, the Christian public becomes alienated, his motives are impugned, his course misinterpreted, and his character

through life is affected. If he continue his studies, and even enter upon the responsible work, merely because he regards himself under the solemnity of a religious vow, to devote his life to the ministry, and feels that the question is irrevocably settled, how great an injury is inflicted upon the interests of the Church, and what a wrong he himself suffers. Whilst many who have been educated in this way, have been found, on trial, fully qualified for the work, it cannot be denied, that not a few, furnished, too, with sound and thorough training, secular as well as religious, are not such ministers as the Church wants. They, however, consider themselves pledged to the ministry, and forbidden, by a sense of duty, to demit the office, retire from its active labors, and support themselvesby secular pursuits. But they alone do not suffer. The community, necessarily, suffers with them. The ministry is, inevitably, brought into disrepute. If there were not truth in the assertion, that many are introduced into the ministry who are not qualified for its duties, why is it that there are so many unemployed ministers, among all denominations, and when a vacancy occurs in a congregation, it is so often said, "He is not the man for the position"—"He is not fitted for the sphere of labor?" When vast fields are spreading and waving their harvests all around us; when the whole world is opening before the Church of God, and wherever she will she may enter in and take possession, is there not work for them to do, or are they so deficient in enterprise, energy, and the great characteristics, required in a minister of the Gospel, as to be disqualified for its duties?

2. We object to the principle, because, even if qualified for the duties, he may, only in consideration of his solemn promise, enter upon the service reluctantly and have no heart for the work. No one should be received into the ministry in opposition to his own wishes or predilections, simply because he has been educated for that purpose, and has given a pledge to that effect. Far better arrest a man on the threshold, release him from all his obligations, than to present to him the temptation of engaging in the labors with no love for Jesus, and with no special interest in the salvation of souls. If we desire none to enter the ministry except such as are moved by these holy attractions, by a strong passion for the work, why should we seek another bond? Why require a pledge from a young man, as a condition of the means for his support, that he will, under every circumstance, enter the ministry, when his character is yet undevel-

oped, his views narrow and limited, and his judgment uncultivated. They enter the ministry, and continue the routine from day to day, just because their ordination vows, which they can never forget, are upon them. They have, in reality, no heart for the work. Their word is, however, pledged under circumstances of great solemnity; the expectations of many kind friends have been excited, and they feel, that if they draw back, if they forsake the ministry, and devote their life to any other profession or pursuit, they will be regarded as traitors to the cause of religion, as having disappointed cherished hopes and wasted the funds of the Church, contributed for the sacred purpose of rearing up a pious and educated ministry. They cannot endure the idea of placing themselves in such a position, or of appearing before the Church as acting in violation of the solemn obligations assumed years before. While they feel that they have no love for the work, no special interest in its duties, they conceal their sentiments and suppress their reluctance under the pressure of their hastily adopted pledge, their conscience, all the time, upbraiding them, and the Church is burdened and cursed with a worldly and heartless ministry.

3. We disapprove of the practice of requiring from young men, at this early stage of their education, an obligation that they will enter the ministry, because it is in direct violation of the principles which govern men, under other circumstances, in reference to the different professions and pursuits of secular life. We never think of selecting individuals for a legislative, judicial, executive or any public position, while they are yet inexperienced youth, before they have received any preparatory instruction, or have been found, by trial, in the possession of these qualities, intellectual and moral, which adapt them to the work. And yet the Church selects her ministers, not from men of mature years, and ripe attainments, but often from materials the most crude, contracted and undeveloped. Those, who are to occupy the most prominent places in the Church, and sustain the highest responsibilities, are often taken from the farm and the shop, before they have passed through any probation, or given any proof of power, or before they themselves have have been able, satisfactorily, to ascertain their own motives or preferences. It may be said, in reply to this, that because a man has been sustained and educated by the Church, it does not necessarily follow that he will be ordained to the work of the ministry; that he must pass through various examinations, and that if

he fail in giving satisfaction, he can easily be arrested in his course and released from his obligations. But what is the result? Seldom is a man rejected. If he has, for some years, been on the funds of the Church, although he may have forfeited the confidence of those, to whose care he has been committed, still there is a great reluctance to cast him off, in consequence of the money already expended on his education, and the hope is still cherished, that there may be an improvement, he may yet be of some use in the service of the Church. He is retained on the funds, continues his studies, finishes his course, applies for licensure, is invested, *speciali gratia*, with ministerial power, and commences the work. He discharges the duties as well as he can, although constantly producing the impression that he is not "the right man in the right place," unwilling, however, to relinquish his nominal connexion with the ministry, lest he may be considered as having broken the pledge assumed at the commencement of his studies, when yet a mere youth, that he would continue in the ministry during life.

4. This practice imposes upon young men, even whilst they are engaged in the prosecution of their studies, responsibilities, which they are not always able to meet. More is demanded than can be reasonably expected from inexperienced youth. The man, who, whilst a student, derives his maintenance from the contributions of the Church, occupies a delicate and undesirable position. On him, it is understood, the Church is expending resources, designed only to be employed in qualifying men to minister at her altar. All eyes are directed towards him. He is subjected to the most rigid scrutiny. He is young and inexperienced. He naturally falls into follies and commits indiscretions. The faults, which would be regarded in others as slight offences, in him are often magnified and freely discussed. He may be pious and sincere in his professions, but human frailty does not always connect with it practical wisdom and prudence. It is not, therefore, surprising, that in his intercourse with others, he should sometimes awaken dissatisfaction and expose himself to censure. The young man is placed in a false position. Too much is expected of him. He is judged by a standard wholly unfair, unsuited to his years, his previous opportunities and present associations. He is brought into relations very different from those of his early life. He has been introduced to the notice of the wealthy and the society of the refined. His former associations, perhaps, were connected

with the obscure and lowly walks of life. The contrast is marked. He is, perhaps, successful. He is noticed and flattered. Early notoriety is always connected with peril, and is, more or less, injurious to the individual, particularly in the case of him who has emerged from obscurity. It is a severe ordeal through which a man has to pass, and it is not astonishing that he sometimes fails, that he is filled with spiritual pride, and becomes vain and hypocritical; that cherished expectations are disappointed, and fond hopes blasted. It is rather the occasion of surprise that he often passes through the trial without material injury, and comes out of the furnace, like gold, seven times purified.

5. The cause of Beneficiary Education is frequently made to suffer, in consequence of the arrangement which, at present, exists. If those, who have been aided by the funds of the Church, prove unworthy subjects, or if, after having given a pledge that they will remain steadfast in the work, they are diverted from the ministry to some other profession, a serious injury is inflicted upon this benevolent institution. If, influenced by aversion to the ministry, they enter upon some pursuit, offering prospects of wealth and fame, it operates against the interests of the work, in discouraging its friends, in impairing confidence in others, and bringing obloquy upon the cause of religion itself. Christians are grieved, wicked men exult, a most prejudicial impression is produced on the irreligious portion of the community, and every benevolent and religious enterprise is unfavorably affected.

When a young man has been taken up by the Church, to be educated, you cannot easily dismiss him, unless he has been guilty of some gross delinquency, or flagrant offence. His case invariably excites sympathy. He has relinquished the business to which he was trained, and in which he was successfully engaged; his prospects have been changed, and without the most substantial and urgent reason, he cannot be readily dropped, and often when the Executive Committee are fully satisfied, in their own minds, as to the unworthiness of the individual, they cannot present the facts and the evidence, so as to convince others of the alleged guilt. Young men should not stand before the public, as candidates for the holy office, until a protracted trial has given evidence of their capacity and sincerity, and proved that their piety is active and progressive. There is scarce a position in society, in which a young man, if he proves faithless to his vows, or disgraces his Christian profession, imposes a more serious and cruel

wrong upon others, and works a more extended injury to a good cause, than the position which he occupies, as a Beneficiary of the Church.

The question now, naturally arises, what plan can, then, be substituted in place of the present system, which may operate more efficiently and successfully for the attainment of the object which we desire to accomplish, for the best interests of Zion, and the advancement of God's glory. Our proposition is, that the enterprise be so conducted as to confer the advantages of a liberal education, upon decided and promising talent, in every condition of society. Good moral character should, of course, be made a *sine qua non*, an indispensable requisite, for without it, the best talent furnishes no adequate prospect or security of usefulness, and the influence of the unprincipled and vicious, is always mischievous and demoralizing. But no obligation should be required, from the subject, for any particular profession or pursuit. On the completion of his education, the young man should be left at liberty to follow the convictions of conscience, and the decisions of his own judgment. He should be required only to pledge his word and honor, that he will improve his advantages, to the best of his ability, in acquiring a thorough education, and conducting himself with Christian propriety, during the prosecution of his studies; and his obligations to the Church should be considered as cancelled, if he shall faithfully employ his talents in that profession, or pursuit, which his own inclination and taste may dictate. The aid, of which he has been the recipient, should be regarded as the reward of diligent and successful effort, of exemplary and faithful deportment. There is no object more worthy of the benevolent action of the Church, than the free admission, into our evangelical Colleges, of indigent, deserving talent, and adequate provision for its systematic and thorough cultivation, under the influence of enlightened and pious instruction. The plan proposed is not a modern or novel idea. It has prevailed, for many centuries, in all the principal countries of Europe. In the Universities of Paris and Bologna, the benefactions of the wealthy conferred upon the indigent student effectual relief: houses were furnished, free board provided, and the necessary expenses of the schools defrayed. In some of the institutions of Scotland, at the present time, one-third of the students are thus aided. The generous assistance has, in many instances, been rendered by individuals who, themselves, in early life, encountered formidable diffi-

culties, in consequence of their embarrassed circumstances. In England, at Oxford and Cambridge, Colleges were endowed, for indigent students, by munificent patrons of letters; some of the ablest men, in every department of Church and State, received their education in the charitable schools of the country, and in their subsequent laudable efforts, for the amelioration of the race, and the advancement of the Church, amply discharged all debt of obligation which they had incurred. This seems to have been, very much, the original design in the founding of Colleges, in the early history of our own land. The Pilgrim Fathers entertained the conviction that, by means of the College, they must undertake not only to prepare men for the ministry, but also to mould the thought and sentiment of the nation, in its whole extent, by the profound, liberal and Christian education of leading minds; to sanctify, by the purifying, ennobling influences of the Gospel, the literature and science of the country. We find the following language employed in one of the petitions presented to their Colonial Assembly: "That from a sincere regard to, and zeal for upholding the Protestant religion, by a succession of learned and orthodox men, they proposed that a Collegiate school should be erected in the colony, wherein youth should be instructed in all parts of learning, to qualify them for public employments in Church and State." Provision was made to sustain, at College, all young men of suitable character, whose parents were not able to furnish them with the requisite means, no matter what was their intention in regard to their future profession. The idea was, that men were needed, not only as ministers of the Church, but as ministers of the State; that there were other spheres of usefulness, mighty and influential, in which educated mind was to be exerted. The same feeling, too, existed among the Patriarchs of the Lutheran Church, and the same plan, to a limited extent, was practiced in their Parochial Schools. For the want of the adequate means, and the entirely missionary character of their operations, they were unable to found and endow Collegiate Institutions.

Our Colleges should, then, be placed under the most decided and efficient religious influences. They should sustain a different, a more intimate relation to the Church. They should be patronized with high religious motives. More of the religious element should be infused into them. A larger amount of religious instruction should be imparted, and earnest, fervent supplication, on their behalf, should ascend to

the mercy-seat, all over the Church, that God's work may be revived in them, that the mind, therein educated, may be sanctified, and the youth, gathered within their Halls, may be all brought under the benign influences of Divine truth and led to devote their cultivated intellect to the service of the Chnrch. Our youth of promising talent should be sent to them, and provision made for the support of the indigent, with the sanguine hope and earnest prayer, that with the Divine blessing they may acquire wisdom, human and divine, become qualified for usefulness, either in the Church or State, and use their influence in the diffusion of human happiness, and the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom.

We believe, the plan suggested would correct many of the evils, at present, connected with the education of youug men, in indigent circumstances, for the Christian ministry. It would keep out of the sacred office, many who seem utterly unfit for its duties, and others who, although intellectually qualified, have no heart for the work; it would not violate a principle which we adopt, under other circumstances, in connexion with the varied professions and pursuits of life, or impose upon young men, in the early stages of their education, responsibilities which they cannot reasonably be expected to meet. The result of the change, we think, would be beneficial to the intellectual, as well as the moral and religious condition of our Colleges. The influence would be salutary and happy upon the character of all professions and pursuits, and operate most favorably upon the ministry. in elevating its character and increasing its efficiency. Church and State would be greatly benefitted by the change proposed, the standard of scholarship in our Colleges elevated, morals improved, and the cause of religion advanced.

# ARTICLE VII.

## THESES UPON THE CHURCH,

*With particular reference to the determination of them, by our Symbolical Books. By Dr. Theodore Harnack, Professor at Erlangen.*

Translated by Rev. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M., Professor in Pennsylvania College.

### A. Introductory.

1. In the animated investigations, which have been in progress among us for years, with reference to the idea of the Church, and which, unfortunately, have not yet led to a satisfactory result, this circumstance may have, to no little extent, delayed an understanding, that those engaged in them did not keep in view, with sufficient distinctness and consistency, the proposition: *The Church belongs to the Credo, it is an article of faith*, and that in accordance with this, *Church* and *Christianity* have not always been clearly and correctly distinguished. And yet the Church alone belongs to the *Credo*, whilst Christianity, as such, does not.

> "Credo unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam, sanctorum communionem." (Symb. Apost. and Nicæn.)
>
> By Christianity we do not understand the material form, but the earthly garment of it; the changeable, external, empirical form in which it is presented to our view.
>
> "Et hic articulus necessaria de causa propositus est. Infinita pericula videmus, quæ minantur ecclesiæ interitum. Infinita multitudo est impiorum in ipsa ecclesia, qui opprimunt eam. Itaque ne desperemus, sed sciamus ecclesiam tamen mansuram esse . . . . has consolationes proponit nobis articulus ille in symbolo: Credo sanctam catholicam ecclesiam." (Apol. Müller, p. 153.)

2. Of what decisive importance it is, to make a distinction, and a correct distinction, between Church and Chris-

tianity, may be seen already in the outset, in the opposite principles which the scripturally and confessionally correct idea of the Church excludes. For that view, which simply makes both identical, and confounds the essence of the Church with a definite historical form of its appearance, constitutes the fundamental error of *Romanism;* and so also the false separation of the two elements to such an extent, as to volatilize the earthly reality of the Church, designates the material error of the *Unionism* of the present day, in its different phases. The former leads to Churchly *fanaticism*, the latter to Churchly *indifference*, even supposing that they do not already originate from the one or the other.

3. The question for us is, therefore, concerning the Church, because, and as far as, it is an object of our faith. This element must be the controlling one in our investigation; all others must be subordinate to it. We, therefore, inquire about the ecclesia, "*perpetuo mansura*," (A. C. art. VII,) *i. e.*, the Church in its essential character, which is ever one and like to itself, amid all the changes of the times and mutation of forms, which was found in the first moment of its origin, on the day of Pentecost, which is still the same at present, and will continue to be such, when the Lord comes.

> "Quum definitur ecclesia, necesse est *eam* definiri, quæ est *vivum corpus Christi.*" (Apol. 154.)

4. This idea of the Church, can neither be derived from its empirical condition, nor be constructed in a *priori* manner, from the essential character of faith, or even of religion: Christianity alone has, and is acquainted with a Church. It is a Divine *act* and *institute* of salvation, and, therefore, to be recognized altogether from its *position within the Divine economy of salvation* in general, and from the *fact of its institution*, in particular.

5. The Church is altogether included in the idea and essential character of the *Kingdom of God.* Church and Kingdom of God are, on the one side, not identical, for the latter embraces all the gracious institutions and operations of God in the past, present and future. On the other side both are united, for the Church is the earthly mode of existence of the Kingdom of God, in its present phase, as *Kingdom of Christ.* It represents the peculiar worldly state and mission of the Kingdom of God, in the *intermediate* and *transition period*, which lies between the departure of the crucified and risen Christ to the Father, and his subsequent return.

6. This, therefore, is its position as an *economy of salvation:* enclosed by the two appearances of Christ, reposing upon the first, waiting for the second, she lives and continues, solely through the invisible, but real active operation, on the earth, of the unlimited power and gracious presence of the exalted Christ her Lord.

7. Her *foundation is Christ*, the one made flesh, in his humiliation and in his exaltation. During his labors *on earth*, he made all the arrangements which were necessary for the existence of the Church, by calling and gathering together the apostles and disciples, by his testimony, commissions, regulations and institutions. But she is not a simple, naturally necessary, or, by herself, intelligible result of the antecedent agency of Christ, but, whilst she has the elements of her being in this, she is indebted for her actual and continued existence to that previously promised, new, and constantly progressive, personal attestation of the exalted Christ, which had its incipient commencement in the *outpouring of the Holy Ghost*, on the day of Pentecost. *This is the act of the Lord which founds the Church.*

## B. The Founding of the Church.

8. Through the *miracle* of *Pentecost*, the Church had its origin in and with the first Pentecostal congregation. From this occurrence alone, the *origin* and *true nature* of the Church becomes known and is determined.

9. From it we learn, first of all, that the Church did not originate *by the will of man*, that it is, also, not a creation of faith; in general, not a work of pious admonitions, determinations, or purposes, on the part of men, (ancient and modern Communism,) but a work of Divine thoughts and deeds, a *gracious institution* of God upon earth, more particularly: a *creation of Jesus Christ*, the exalted and living one.

10. Thus already result these two propositions: 1) that the Church is a *holy objectivity*, independent of worldly agencies, existing solely by the absolute omnipotence and gracious presence of Christ in the world, carrying in herself, therefore, the principle of her life, which objectivity occupies a position above the individuals which belong to her; and, 2) that, as a result of the Divine purpose to save, based upon grace and faith alone, she is altogether *evangelical in her nature*, and no *legal institution.*

The Christian Church "is the mother who generates and nourishes each individual Christian by the word of God," etc. Larger Catechism, p. 458. Church and people of the law. Apol. p. 154.

11. Christ, however, creates the Church by the *outpouring of the Holy Ghost*, who shows himself to be the Spirit of Christ, by closely connecting his operations with the *historical* ministry of the Lord in the flesh, and by subordinating himself altogether to this. For as he begins his agency in the *circle* of those whom Christ has gathered about himself on earth, and in whom faith has already made a beginning, though a weak one, so also is it, subsequently, altogether dependent upon Christ, not only in *substance* and *design*, but also in its *mode* and *manner*, inasmuch as he has limited himself and his operations *to these provisions and institutions of Christ.* (Pt. 7.)

12. The Holy Ghost does not so communicate himself to this body of disciples, as to apprehend first some prominent individuals, and then, through these, others, but he descends upon all at the same time, apostles and disciples, men and women, and whilst he brings to perfection, in the heart of each one, by *personal regeneration*, the *incipient faith*, unites them with Christ and each other, into an organized *Christian congregation.* Thus he creates, not an ideal spiritual community, but a *spiritual*, *i. e.*, one animated by the Spirit of Christ, *congregation of believers actually existing upon earth.*

Before the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, the "Acts of the Apostles" designates those assembled together as ὄχλος τῶν μαθητῶν (1. 15), after this, as ἐκκλησία or πλῆθος τῶν πιστευόντων (2, 44. 47. 4, 23.).

In this extraordinary Church-founding act of the Holy Ghost, connected with the antecedent influence of the Lord upon his disciples, is comprehended that which he, in the same way, and subsequently, through the preservation and edification of the Church, effects by the word and baptism.

13. Finally, the miracle of tongues proves the *call* of this congregation to be *for the whole world.* For Christ desires to continue his work in the world, by her service, in an earthly human way, and preserve and edify his Church through the Church. The Pentecostal congregation acknowledges

this as its mission, maintains the same at once by the preaching of the word, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and in this way increases extensively and intensively. Acts 2 : 14, sq. 37, sq.)

## C. The Nature of the Church.

### *a. Thesis.*

14. We have seen that the Pentecostal act consists in an operation of the Holy Ghost, *upon the hearts* of the company of disciples, by which they were united into a congregation of Christ, and also, through these, upon the hearts of the willing multitude, (Act 2 : 37, 41 : 44.) Thus he creates and builds up *one* congregation of such as believe in Christ, (in the unlimited power and gracious presence of the crucified and exalted Christ,) and makes them to be in his, and *Christ's stead* in the world, and as such the organ of his continued agency in it. This congregation is the *Church of Christ*, in the first moment of its existence. This is its essential character, which remains unchangeable, under every variation of form; certainly, therefore, as such, she is an object of faith, and solely in this aspect do we ask, What is the Church?

15. We have, therefore, as the result of the above, to distinguish between and examine, an *objective* and a *subjective* side, and consequent thereupon, her *two-fold relation*: her *vital relation to Christ*, and her *missionary relation to the world.*

16. *Objectively* considered, the Church is a production and a testimony, *i. e.*, product of that activity of the exalted Christ, which continually manifests its existence and agency, in the founding and preservation of the Church, which he exercises in the world for applying and perfecting the salvation, objectively completed in him, in the hearts of men. Thus far the Church is the *place* and *form of his activity in the world*, originated by Christ, the organism of his active spirit, generated by himself, the σῶμα, of which he is the head, and with which he is so closely united, that the apostle is able to use directly χριστὸς, for σῶμα χριστοῦ (1 Cor. 12 : 12.)

17. But the activity of Christ, through his Spirit, considered by itself alone, is not yet the Church, but this is always the *unity* of his *action*, and its designed and accomplished *result*, viz, *faith*, therefore the *unity of the active objective,*

*and the completed subjective side:* one body and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Ephes. 4 : 4, 5.

> "The word of God and the true faith."—Artic. Smalc. III 12.

18. It is, therefore, erroneous, when, for the sake of maintaining the objectivity of the Church, we define the idea of it, in a one-sided way, by the Divinely determined conditions. For *Christ*, in his character of God-man, is not the Church, but its head, which first shows itself to be this, in the creation of his body. *Grace* is not the Church, but its foundation, which requires and creates faith; the *Holy Ghost* is not the Church, but the personal, vital principle of the organism which it begets and animates; still less are the *means of grace*, in themselves, the Church, their administration implies indeed, already, (as the day of Pentecost shows us,) the existence of the Church, as a congregation, or assembly of believers.

19. The Church is always only then and there to be found, when and where there is *faith*. Not, as though faith, although constituting the Church, were a Church-generating factor equally with grace and the Holy Ghost, for grace alone works faith. The Church is much more solely a work of Christ, but such a one as is only Church-creating and Church-building, inasmuch as it creates and maintains faith, therefore a Divine edifice, which he erects for himself in and out of individual believers, *i. e.*, a *Divine-human* reality, as her head is the God-man.

20. In the *subjective* or *earthly human* aspect, the Church is, therefore, the *community* (not merely communion) consisting of believers, which is united by *one* faith, the *spiritual* people of God.

> This remains certainly true, that those men are the true Church, who believe truly on Christ . . . . . and are governed by one Holy Spirit," (Apol. p. 134.) "Ecclesia est populus spiritualis, verus populus Dei, renatus per Spiritum Sanctum," (Id.) See for "Communion" and "community, "Luther, Larger Cat., p. 457.

21. If we look at both sides, in the aggregate, the Church is, in its essence, the spiritual organism of the body of Christ in the world, formed out of believers, by the active agency of Christ and his Spirit; an organism in which Christ gives

himself form upon earth, (Gal. 4 : 19,) and which, because *product* and *place* of the generating grace, and *support* of self-attesting *faith*, is also the exclusive *organ* of all the saving activity of Christ in the world.

Of the Church, in its essence, Protestantism does not only say: ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia, but also, ubi ecclesia, ibi Christus, and therefore, also, extra ecclesiam nulla salus. See Larger Cat., p. 456. "Where Christ is not preached, there is no Holy Spirit, who makes, calls and unites the Christian Church, *outside of which no one can come to the Lord Jesus Christ.* See also Apol. p. 163.

22. In both aspects, the continuance and the life of the established Church, is altogether conditioned upon the *administration and use of the means of grace, the word and the sacraments;* for as Christ and his Spirit continue to work no otherwise, than through the means, so also is faith bound, for its origin and continuance, to the use of the same, (Pt. 12, R. 2.)

"Regnum Christi tantum cum verbo et sacramentis existit." Apol. p. 163.

"Quare in hoc nobis est constanter perseverandum, quod Deus non velit nobiscum aliter agere nisi per vocale verbum et sacramenta, et quod, quidquid sine verbo et sacramentis jactatur, ut spiritus, sit ipse diabolus," (Art. Smalc. p. 322.)

23. In accordance with this, the Church is the congregation of believers, created and governed by Christ, animated by his Spirit, united in one faith, and absolutely bound to the administration and use of the means of grace, or as the A. C., VII, defines it, the "congregatio sanctorum (*i. e.* vere credentium Art. VIII,) in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta."

Ecclesia est "congregatio sanctorum, qui habent inter se societatem ejusdem evangelii seu doctrinæ et ejusdem Spiritus Sancti qui corda eorum renovat, sanctificat et gubernat," (Apol. p. 153.)

This golden article of the Augustana, in which the Reformers were enabled, in the midst of a period of complete confusion in reference to the idea of the Church, to avoid the contiguous by-paths to the right and the left, and to follow the correct track of the

normal Scriptural view, correctly defines, both positively and negatively, the proper limits to be observed, as well as the direction to be taken. The labors of Lutheran Theology, can be prosecuted only within the decisions of this Article, which may be made more profound, be more clearly specified, and be conducted to a greater extent, but which cannot be violated without treading upon the domain of the fanatical civitas Platonica, or of the Roman politia canonica, by which those limits pass in close contiguity on both sides.

24. The Church, as this congregation of believers collected around Christ and his means of grace, is, indeed, primarily, not an external institution, but a *spiritual congregational body*, but as such, from the first moment of its existence onwards, is partly sensuous and supersensuous, material and spiritual, or, according to the usual mode of designation, visible and invisible, partly an *organism*, which, even from its earliest origin, carries within herself, all the conditions necessary to her organization.

25. She is, therefore, in her nature, not purely invisible, nor something entering into the world of vision. For *Christ and his Spirit* are not merely invisible, but *visible and audible* in the word and sacraments, and so also *faith makes itself known*, in its testimonies to the word, and in the use of the sacraments, *i. e.*, in *confessing Christ by word and deed.*

26. *Visibility*, therefore, belongs to the *essential* Church, not merely in an accessory manner, but *necessarily;* not only as a consequence, but *originally;* not only in the human, but also in the *Divine aspect.* Otherwise she would have no earthly reality, could not be an object of faith, and could not accomplish her mission in the world. Besides, the essential and empirical Church would then stand alongside of each other, united by no other bond than the loose one of mere human volition and action.

The partial view of the essential or true Church, as of one altogether invisible, produces, as is shown by history, indifference, not only as regards the visible, but also the Church in general, and puts in place of the Divine creation of the congregation of Jesus Christ, that human conception of an ideal "commu-

nion," for which, indeed, certain, though self-selected, external signs, are found to be indispensable.

27. But this *visibility* of the Church, is not a complex collection of developed, established forms, institutions, customs and regulations, as is maintained in the Romish doctrines, but it is that original, simple mode of appearance, continually like to itself in its essential features, in which Christ at the same time verifies his means of grace, and the Church her faith, in this presence and activity—so that in *the administration of the means of grace*, where Christ and the Church, grace and faith meet, that visibility is given to the Church, in a manner as marked as it is *sufficient* and *perceptible*, which belongs to her essential character and mission.

28. This visibility is *marked*, partly because it belongs only to the Church, partly, and particularly, because in her, Christ and faith, not at any time alone, but in their reciprocal communion, which constitutes, indeed, the essence of the Church, allow themselves to become known in an earthly way; and it is *sufficient*, both to defend the Church from that power of sense, which fails to recognize, though it beholds her, and also to render possible and to support faith in the existence of the Church, without making it unnecessary or substituting sight in its room.

The Romish established Church, and the spiritualistic Church of the Spirit, both do away with the Church as an object of faith; for the former *needs* not to be believed, it is visible "as the Republic of Venice," and the latter *cannot* be believed, as it is only invisible.

29. The *administration of the sacraments* is, therefore, the characteristic and altogether sufficient mark of the Church. Nothing can be added to it; everything else (the appointed forms of worship, discipline, constitution) is to be subordinated to her, and is to be brought into consideration, first in a second order, and one altogether dependent upon her, as proofs of a proof, *i. e.*, as a complex mode and form, or as a pledge and rule of her scriptural and confessional practice.

30. Therefore, we say with the Apology (p. 152): Ecclesia non est *tantum* societas externarum rerum ac rituum, sicut aliæ politiæ, sed *principaliter* (*i. e.*, the essential or true Church, in contrast with the above-designated external

Christianity) *est societas fidei et Spiritus Sancti in cordibus* (invisible side) quæ tamen habet externas notas, ut agnosci possit (visible side), videlicet puram evangelii doctrinam et administrationem sacramentorum, consentaneam evangelio Christi. Et *hacc* ecclesia *sola* dicitur *corpus Christi.* And p. 155: Neque vero somniamus nos Platonicam civitatem, sed dicimus *existere hanc ecclesiam*, videlicet *vere credentes* ac justos sparsos per orbem. Et addimus notas cet. See also p. 157, 28.

Here evidently a double mode of appearance of the Church is distinguished: the externa politia with its regulations and customs, which do not constitute the ecclesia principaliter, and the notæ externæ belonging to the latter. Both were, subsequently, and even to our own times, unfortunately confounded, whilst by "visible Church," they understood without any distinction, the whole empirical state of it, placed the invisible Church in contrast with it, and so contributed not a little, though involuntarily, to the origin and diffusion of the error, that the Church in her essence and truth, is only the invisible one. As much, therefore, as the expression, "visible and invisible," recommends itself, for the designation of both sides of the essential character of the Church, still it is equally calculated to mislead and to produce confusion, where it is used in the way designated. It would have been, in general, therefore well, if writers, in the recent investigations, had used as a guide, to a greater extent than has been the case, the unsurpassed Article of the Apology de ecclesia.

### b. Antithesis.

31. The idea of the Church, thus obtained, corresponds as well with the miracle of Pentecost, as the congregation founded by it, as it also agrees with our Confession. It is clear and definite enough, to enable any one who is in earnest, to become acquainted with the questions; what and where the Church of Christ on earth is, to as great an extent as is necessary, for him to believe and be saved; to include all believers, of every stage and degree, the children in Christ, and the full-grown man; the minors, as well as those most advanced in spirituality.

32. But, as on the one side, it is opposed to that errone-

ous, hierarchical or sectarian view, in accordance with which the Church principaliter, is intended to be the *congregation of the ordained*, or a *community of the inspired*, or of *saints* of a particular *selection*, *kind* and *degree*, so, also, it excludes that idea, so frequently maintained among us, by which the Church is defined to be, *the congregation of the baptized.* We must, however, offer our dissent to this, for a variety of reasons, whilst it will be understood, as a matter of course, that we are not directing our attention to baptized children, but adults.

33. In the first place, this definition makes the nature of the Church *external*, whilst in opposition, both to Scripture and the Reformation, it transfers its centre of gravity, from within, to the outside, and breaks the Divinely ordained, inseparable connection of *baptism* and the *word.* It is, therefore, at the same time, too *extended* and too *narrow*; too extended, because it does not give to *faith* its appropriate value; too narrow, because it does not do justice to the *word*, and, therefore, excludes all those unbaptized, in whom already, by the operation of the antecedent word, a corresponding faith has been produced. Consistently, therefore, from this stand-point, we would be obliged to say, the Church is *the congregation of the called*, but thus the design of that definition would fail.

34. Besides, it is in opposition to the occurrence at Pentecost, (Pt. 12 and 18,) in accordance with which, this, at least, is fixed, that not baptism alone, but *baptism* (outpouring of the Holy Ghost) and *faith* constitute the Church, and that it did not originate by baptism, but through the saving and *active* outpouring of the Holy Spirit, *i. e.*, a congregation of Jesus Christ, which, with other things, has alone the right and power to baptize.

35. This view, therefore, amounts to a *petitio principii* unless they wish to make baptism a mere external rite, and to be altogether unconcerned about the proper subjects of baptism. For to baptize and to be baptized, assumes already the existence of the Church and, indeed, as a *community of believers;* without this assumption, baptism, however correctly performed, is not Christian baptism, but a counterfeit, empty ceremony.

36. Still further, it dissolves the essential connection which subsists between the present kingdom of Christ (as Church) and the future kingdom of glory. For whilst both are so vastly different in the development and manifestation,

they are still one and the same kingdom of God, whose essence consists, indeed, in the mutual, not one-sided, communion of God and his people in Christ.

> Semper enim hoc est regnum Christi, quod Spiritu suo vivificat, sive sit revelatum (future), sive sit tectum cruce (present). Sicut idem est Christus, qui nunc glorificatus est, antea afflictus erat. Apol. p. 155.

37. This definition fails also, of *one* of its *objects*, to give the most evident manifestations to the visibility of the Church; for we can see that a person has been baptized, just as little as that he has had the word preached to him, whilst conversely, faith is able to make itself known, and though conditionally, still it is cognizable. Nor does it attain its *other object*, to give, as it presumes, simplicity to symbolic instruction, and to free it from difficulties, without creating greater difficulties, by doing violence to the evangelical idea of the Church, and robbing this, in reality, of the peculiarity and dignity of an article of faith.

38. In fact, also, baptism (and the preached word) only gives the *limits*, to which the *agency* of the Church on earth extends, and within which it actually exists; but the field within which she labors, and the extent of her labors, can never be made use of, as a rule, by which to define her essential character.

39. If the centre of gravity of the Church is transferred, as is the case in this view of it, in so one-sided a manner to baptism, an error is made in the very outset, by looking, in the first instance, at those already baptized, and not at those to be baptized. For the existence of the Church is not proved by the fact, that any one has received baptism, but that there are thousands there, or that there is a congregation of Christ there, invested with the right of baptism. Then that view will conduct us, just as we look at the subject, either back again to the Augustana, to be rectified and completed by it; or forwards to unevangelical consequences, which will compel us to regard the Church *principaliter* as a baptismal institution, *i. e.*, in general an external one. Therefore the intended correction of the Augustana amounts to a mutilation of it, for it substitutes, in place of the clear thesis and antithesis of the Reformation, a mongrel Church, which is neither Romish nor Evangelical, and is, therefore, useless in the proposed historical relations.

40. The fundamental error of this view, may consist in this, that it reverses the proper order of the question, and wishes to give the answer to the main question, What is the Church? by the prior answer of the subordinate question, Who belongs to the Church? But to the first question there is but *one* correct answer, and this can be given, also, in accordance with the Scripture; therefore the first place belongs to it. Neither the one nor the other holds, with reference to the other question, for here we must say, "the Lord knows those that are his," and each individual, also may, just in proportion to his conduct, belong to the Church, *without making any change affecting, in the smallest degree, her true character.* If we change the proper order of the question, we will not be able to avoid an idea of the Church, which leads to an error, for this reason: because we are endeavoring to determine the essential character of the Church by its empirical condition.

> Even Romish Theology asks first, *Where* is the Church? for the purpose of deciding thereby, *What* it is. Only it puts more correctly, in place of the baptized, the baptizers, *i. e.*, the ordained or the episcopate. See, on the contrary, Apol. p. 154.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### OUR NATIONAL CRISIS.

"*The Threatening Ruin; or, Our Times, our Prospects and our Duty.* A discourse delivered in St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia, on the occasion of the National Fast, January 4, 1861. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D."

"*Government and Christianity: A Sermon for the Times.* By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., Pastor of St. John's Church, Philadelphia," 1861.

The present crisis in our national affairs, and the great Southern rebellion, have employed the thoughts and occupied the pens, of our ablest theologians, whilst they have absorbed

the attention of our practical men, in every department of society, as well as of our most profound statesmen. Drs. Hodge and Breckenridge, on the one side, in defence of our Union, our Constitution and its laws, and Drs. Thornwell and Palmer, on the other, as apologists for secession, rebellion, the destruction of our National Government and the adoption of new theories of society and government, by the defence of slavery and a denial of our great fundamental principles of the natural equality of man, have furnished us with very able discussions of the great principles, as well as of the practical questions here involved. But they have, by no means, exhausted the subject. Dr. Seiss' sermons are of a different character, and have other objects in view. The first, following the current of Dr. Seiss' favorite theory of Christ's Second Advent, endeavors to show, that "the close of the present order of earthly things" is at hand, which he endeavors to prove by the corruptions and disorders of the times, by our national troubles, as well as by the revolutions threatening, and in progress, in other lands. Or, to state his position in his own language,—"It is clear to me, that very sore trials and most trying judgments, are yet in reserve for *all the nations of the earth;* that, as we draw towards the close of the present order of earthly things, we must expect 'troublous times,'—times of great social and religious disturbance,—times of political disasters and perplexities,—times of commotion and war, and revolutionary upheavings,—times of civil earthquakes, disruptions and overturnings,—times of calamity, distress and judgment, and all sorts of perfidy and bloodshed, and usurpations,—times when the whole earth shall reel and stagger with delirium and madness, under God's terrific visitations for its long accumulating sins." Waiving all discussions of the nature and nearness of Christ's second advent, we entirely agree with Dr. Seiss, that a mighty revolution is now in progress in our own country, as well as throughout the whole civilized and Christian world, which is also to affect the destiny of other nations, in a very high degree. But we can not agree with him, that either our own country, or the world generally, is threatened with irretrievable ruin, and that the end of all things is now at hand. On the contrary, we believe that these changes will be salutary, and that they tend to the introduction of a better state of things, a higher civilization, greater personal and political virtue, and a purer and more practical Christianity.

Confining ourselves, more particularly, to the political aspects of this question, we acknowledge with Dr. Seiss, not only "the intricate, entangled and threatening aspect of our political affairs," but also their utter corruption and rottenness, about which there can be no doubt since the wholesale plundering of our national Treasury, by the officers to whose trust it was committed, the violation of their most solemn oaths, by State officials, and officers of the army and navy, and the reckless plunging of whole States and communities, into all the horrors of civil war, without any possible excuse for the crime. But we think that we can clearly see how all this tends to bring about a better state of things. Just as storms and hurricanes tend to purify the atmosphere, so "the wrath of man," all his evil passions and corruptions, social as well as individual, "shall praise God;" shall be made to promote his glory, in the good of man and his increasing happiness, "and the remainder thereof will He restrain." In other words, we believe that Christianity, or the power of Christ, is to be applied to nations as well as to individuals; that it is to purify national, as well as individual character, to regenerate nations as well as individuals. So we understand David, when he says, in the second Psalm: "*Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings: be instructed ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.*" Such also we take to be the import of those declarations of the New Testament, which set forth, that Christ is "*King of kings and Lord of lords,*" and that "*at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow—of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth.*"—"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever." Rev. 11: 15.

Undoubtedly God punishes nations, as well as individuals, for their violations of His laws. But he is also merciful to penitent nations, as well as to penitent individuals. Thus we see how often Israel was spared, upon its repentance, and the pen of inspiration has recorded, with especial care, the wonderful dealings of God with Nineveh, which He spared, even after his chosen prophet had so plainly and emphatically denounced its destruction. Nor can we doubt, that even Jerusalem would have been spared, had it truly repented and listened to the Saviour's call, "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! how often would I have gathered thee, as a hen doth her brood under her wings: but ye would not." We should be very

sorry to preach "peace when there is no peace," but we feel ourselves fully authorized, by God's revelations, both in his Word and in his Providence, that is, in national history, to give the unhesitating assurance, that He will spare even the guiltiest nation, if it "ceases to do evil and learns to do well."

The question, then is, Is there any hope, any evidence of our national improvement, in morals and religion, that is to say, of repentance and obedience to the Divine law? Dr. Seiss has (on pp. 18–22) given us a most graphic and fearful picture of the prevalence of corruption and sin all over our nation, the truth and correctness of which we do not pretend to call in question. But he has overlooked several very important qualifications and corrections of all of these fearful evils. For observe, first, that all these crimes are not only forbidden, but also punished by our national laws, and condemned by our national conscience. And, secondly, that, notwithstanding many checks and failures, we are still advancing towards a higher and truer civilization, clearer consciousness of our national character and destiny, and of the means by which our aims are to be attained.

But it will be said, that all this is contradicted by the great rebellion, the terrible national struggle in which we are now engaged, the awful demoralization by which it has been initiated, and the terrible ferocity, barbarism and bloodshed with which it is conducted. To this we reply, that we do not so understand the facts nor the principles involved in this struggle. In order to obtain clear views of our national character and development, we must understand the great problems involved in the national life and constitution of our American Republic. These we take to be, first, an effort to secure liberty, civil and ecclesiastical, regulated by law; secondly, a true and vigorous national life and unity, under a wise and well-balanced constitution, for the security and proper enjoyment of this liberty; and, finally, the restriction of government to its proper functions, as an agency for the general good, and not for individual aggrandizement, not an engine of oppression, but for the securing to each individual of all his rights, of person and property. That these are the grand objects of our national organization and life, is manifest, not only from our general and State Constitutions, but also from the development of our national life, from its

first warm utterance, in the Declaration of Independence, to the mighty national movement in which we are now involved.

That the American Revolution, of 1776, was a great struggle for the securing of religious as well as civil liberty, it is almost superfluous to undertake to prove, though this element has been overlooked even by our most philosophical historians to so great an extent. That the New England Colonies, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Georgia were established with special reference to the securing of religious as well as civil freedom, no one familiar with their history needs to be told. That the Revolution was immediately brought about by the insidious efforts of the British Government to establish the Church of England, as the ruling power in ecclesiastical affairs, as well as an arbitrary and oppressive civil government, is very evident from the action of the New England clergy; from the struggles of the Presbyterians, in New York and Virginia, to assert their rights, and from the unanimity with which the Lutheran population of Pennsylvania, and other German districts, arrayed itself on the side of the Revolution. But upon this point the result is conclusive; no one will doubt that the principle of perfect *religious freedom* has been established as the result of the American Revolution, in the fullest and most unquestionable form.

So, also, in regard to the principle of *national unity*. The Declaration of Independence, whilst separating the thirteen States from the British Empire, undoubtedly united them with each other in such a manner as to make out of them one great and homogeneous nation. It was not a mere league for offence and defence, into which they entered, but a firm national compact, which was to be perpetual, which no earthly power was to be permitted to dissolve. Thus it is said, "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for *one people* to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with *another;*" which clearly shows that the States thus acting, felt themselves to be *one people*, to have a national life of their own, which naturally and necessarily separated them from that different people or nation, of which they had hitherto formed a part. The Colonies now withdrew from their connection with the mother country, just as children withdraw from the old home, in order to form a new and perfect family, which is thenceforth to have a life and laws of its own. The union of the thirteen Colonies was not a merely fortuitous and temporary connection,

which might be dissolved at pleasure, but it was a genuine marriage, to be terminated only by the death or moral suicide of one or other of the parties. This is shown alike by the fact that they continued thus united through all the trials of their seven years' war, and that not even the conquest of South Carolina and Georgia, by the Royal Government, could detach those States from the confederacy to which they were restored, not by their own unaided efforts, but by the common force of the whole nation, as displayed either in successful war or triumphant peace. Further, when the old Confederation, which had for its avowed object, "*the perpetual union of the States*," had shown itself too weak and possessed of too little national energy to accomplish the purposes of a national organization, it was at once set aside, or transformed into the present Government under our great national Constitution. That Constitution was the distinct and unequivocal unification of all the elements of our national life. It set aside all ideas of distinct sovereignties in the States, based itself directly upon the will of the whole people, not as expressed by States, but by the people themselves, in their original, indefeasible and absolute right to originate government and give it such a form as was to them agreeable and proper. The avowed object was, the general good and the formation of "*a more perfect union.*" It thus takes for granted that a "*union*," not merely of the States, but also of the people, as the elements underlying and vitalizing those States, already existed, and that all that was necessary was to give it a more full expression and more efficient power. It was "WE THE PEOPLE," *and not we the representatives of the States*, who ordered, enacted and established this glorious Constitution, which has so successfully directed the movements of the nation for the greater part of a century, and which only becomes the dearer to the people the longer it is tried and the more it is assailed. The people here put their own power, as expressed in the Constitution above all State, as well as all individual power. Ratified by the great body of the people, it was made binding for all time to come, and under all circumstances, against all "State Rights," or any enactments by any single State, or combination of States, unless acting under the authority of the Constitution itself; it is "the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution of any State, or the laws of any State to the contrary nothwithstanding." Thus were the people united, under the Constitution, from the Bay of Fun-

dy to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Ohio. Thus has the nation grown, from a body of thirteen States, to four and thirty, and from a population of three millions to thirty millions; from a territory forming a narrow slip along the Atlantic coast, and but little West of the Alleghany mountains, to a great continental empire, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the great Lakes to the Caribbean Sea.

Never in the history of nations has a greater or more perfect nation been developed in the same time, with a more vigorous national life, or a more distinctly marked national character. We say this deliberately, and in view of all the conflicting assertions and apparent falsifications of this claim. Some of these we must consider somewhat in detail, and yet as briefly as possible.

1. The State-Rights' men, who have now assumed the right of secession, or the separation of the several States from the General Govenrment, at their pleasure, maintain that each State has an independent and perfect sovereignty of its own—that it entered the Union at its pleasure, and can withdraw from the Union in the same manner, and that it is utterly unjustifiable, and the most unmitigated tyranny, to deny them this right. But we have already shown that this is not the fact—that this Government was not formed by the *States*, but by the *people* of the States, and that the Constitution expressly denies both to the States and to a minority of the people, the right to make any enactments conflicting with the Constitution, or with the laws made in pursuance of the same. How much less, then, can any State, without the consent of the Constitutional number of other States, required to give validity to such an act, withdraw entirely from the national compact, which would be an utter abrogation of both that Constitution and of all the laws based thereon.

2. But it is said that we have no principle of national unity, that the North and the South are two races and two people, entirely distinct, and that it is utterly vain and absurd to attempt to hold them together; that all their ideas, political, economical, social and religious, are antipodal to each other, and that it is therefore impossible to hold them together. It has become quite fashionable, for some time past, to speak of the North as Puritans and Roundheads, and of the South as Cavaliers and Churchmen. The former are represented as descendants of the Saxons, the latter of the Normans, and the like. Nothing can be farther from the truth;

no claims more groundless. As applied to the great body of the Northern States, as contrasted with the Southern, these statements are preposterous, and even in reference to New England, as distinguished from Virginia, merely plausible, but utterly fallacious. The Norman element in Southern population is very insignificant, and by no means sufficient to distinguish it from the Saxon masses, either of its own territory, or of the North. The Wises, Letchers, Hunters, and other leading spirits of Virginia, at this time, give no indication, either by their physique or by their *names*, that they are of Norman lineage—the name, which is an unmistakeable index of national character, stamps them irrevocably, as of the plainest Saxon stock. Nor can any such claim be set up for John Caldwell Calhoun and George M'Duffie, the true fathers and authors of this Southern movement. Davis and Stephens will find it difficult to trace their pedigree to Normandy, and Beauregard is left almost "alone in his glory," if a Norman name is necessary to establish the patent of a *preux chevalier sons reproche* as a representative of the distinctive character of the South in this direction. But we do not suppose that Beauregard and the Louisiana Creoles, of French descent, are to be taken into the count, because when Normans are spoken of, we take it for granted that Normans from "merrie England," and not the Gallic race of "la belle France" are introduced. The simple truth is, that the Norman of the United States, whether in Virginia or South Carolina, or anywhere else, is but a small fraction of our population, a very slight cross in the blood, which may, indeed, give it some fire, but is not its substantial element, and is, perhaps, found about as abundantly in New England and Illinois, as to the South of Mason's and Dixon's line, of the Ohio or Missouri. Saxon is, indeed, the great basis of our population, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from North to South, although it is everywhere mixed with more or less of every European, to say nothing of an African and Asiatic element. Who does not understand that the presence of the African in the South, or of the Chinaman in California, though both there in very considerable force, does not interfere with the homogeneousness of our national character? How much less, then, does the sprinkling of a little Norman blood, here and there? Our language is everywhere the same, the same vigorous Anglo-Saxon, constantly recruited by the cognate-German tongue, and by new accessions of Germanic population, from the banks of the Rhine and the

Weser, and from the Cimbric Chersonese, as well as from the Scandinavian peninsula. The argument for separate nationalities, as based on separate races, is, therefore, utterly futile. You can no more separate our nation thus, than you can extract these diverse elements from the blood of the individual in whom they have once mingled. The writer can trace back his paternal stock, colored here and there with Scottish blood, to the Saxons whom the Norman conqueror subjugated. But his maternal line flows from the Huguenots, whom the revocation of the Edict of Nantes drove from Southern France. How is he to be ranged in such a contest of races? His father was born North and his mother South of Mason's and Dixon's line. Where does he owe allegiance? With which of the two nations that are to be evoked from this harvest of dragon's teeth, is he to take part? Or must he enter into a contest worse than that which Cadmus beheld, where he is to strike down, not merely his neighbor and his brother, but to apply the sword to his own throat? Do not such facts, which enter into the genealogy of almost every family in the United States, show the utter absurdity of the attempt to divide and array us against each other, on the ground of different national descent.

3. Such also is the case in regard to religious ideas. Puritanism is by no means confined to New England, or to the Northern States. Puritan principles are proclaimed in the pulpits of Baltimore, Richmond, Charleston and New Orleans, with no less vehemence than in Boston or New York. Episcopacy has about as many bishops in the North as in the South. Methodism, and Baptism and other unchurchly systems, are far more rampant, and have more numerous adherents in the extreme South than in the extreme North, and will scarcely return to the bosom of mother Church *in secessia* more readily than in the Union. There is, indeed, a great deal said about the radicalism, infidelity and unchurchliness of the North, but Gliddon and Nott, and other speculators upon the diversity of races, have shown no greater reverence for the Bible than Garrison, Ballou or Parker. Presbyterianism, which is no less Puritanic than Congregationalism, is scarcely less a religious power in the South than the latter is in the North. Lutheranism is just as ready to take root in Texas as in Pennsylvania. It is vain, therefore, to speak of the two sections being characterized by different religious ideas.

4. But the South is in favor of *slavery*, and the North is

opposed to it? Or, slavery grows, expands, prospers in the South and takes possession of it, but dwindles, decays, disappears, and is impossible in the North? This is, undoubtedly, the great problem, the great source of irritation, and that which distinguishes the one section from the other. But not even this is sufficient to make two separate nations of us. Slavery, originally, existed in the North as well as in the South. The people there were just as much attached to it, and had no more scruples of conscience against it, than they have now in the South. Even now, in fact, there are hundreds and thousands of people in the North, who take precisely the same ground, in reference to slavery, that the South does. They regard it as a lawful and Scriptural institution, and have no repugnance whatever against its practice. They would like to introduce it into New York, Pennsylvania, or the valley of the Mississippi, and to hold slaves just as is done in Virginia, or any other Southern State. Northern men who go to the South, are very willing to marry a handsome Carolina girl who is the heiress of a fine "plantation, with ninety-nine and a driver." On the contrary, there are many Southern men, in the cotton and sugar States, as well as in Maryland and Virginia, who look with abhorrence upon slavery, and cherish the same sentiments in regard to it, as did Charles Carroll, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and other illustrious men, who died in the belief and prayer that their States might be delivered from this incubus, and this foul stain be blotted from their country's escutcheon. Slavery is almost extinct in Delaware. It is steadily decreasing in Maryland and Missouri. One half of Virginia is up in arms against it. Kentucky looks with still increasing dissatisfaction upon it. Western Texas is teeming with Germans who raise cotton, and have demonstrated that free labor is practicable even in the extreme South. There is, therefore, no such diversity of opinion, upon this subject, between the North and the South, as is asserted, no unchangeable unanimity in the South in its favor, no evidence that slavery may not, in the course of time, disappear from the South just as it has done from the North. The North claims no right to interfere with slavery in any of the States where it now exists, but acknowledges its Constitutional obligations to restore fugitive slaves, whenever they are claimed under the Constitution and laws provided for this purpose. There is, therefore, no more reason why the South should be uneasy and dissatisfied on this subject

now, than it was at the time when the Constitution was adopted, or for half a century afterwards. The hostility to slavery is no greater now than it was then, is no more aggressive, and has no greater power of interference.

5. But it is said that the South now regards the Declaration of Independence, that is to say, the great principle laid down in its first sentence—"*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*"—as the πρωτον ψευδος, the fundamental error, the first great mistake in our political system, and the Constitution which is based on this, as a great failure, not answering the purpose for which it was framed, and utterly destructive of the rights and interests! Well, we are sorry to hear it, but we think that the South, or rather that little knot of crazy politicians, who undertake to think and act for them, are utterly mistaken. In fact, they flatly contradict themselves, and show an utter inability to establish any other principles, or to contrive any other Constitution, that will either better, or as well answer the objects for which all government has been instituted. Do they not, in order to justify their attempt at revolution, appeal to these very principles? Do they not appeal to their inalienable rights, and declare that they are fighting for their "*liberty*" and other great principles set forth in our Declaration as "inalienable rights?" Do they not copy the language and ape the forms of our Constitution, without making any changes which would not be much more attainable, wherever they are desirable, under the Constitution, than by its destruction and without it? Do they not themselves feel that they are wretchedly and ridiculously inconsistent, when they declare that they are contending for "liberty" for themselves, liberty to enslave, and hold in perpetual bondage, others, even though it be a race, black or brown, mulatto or quadroon?

But what is the inference that we draw from these things, and from the whole Southern rebellion? Why, clearly, that leading minds of the South have come to a consciousness of the inconsistency of slavery with the great principles which underlie and direct the movements of our Government. They cannot reconcile the existence of negro slavery with the fundamental declaration with which our Revolution set out, "*that all men are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights,*" or with the determination of the

Constitution, that it is ordained and established, "*in order to establish justice, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.*" They feel themselves disgraced and degraded by this condemnation of their practice and of the forms and institutions of society which they have adopted. With all the feelings and habits of an aristocracy, with a keen sense of personal honor, ambitious and desirous of power, they cannot brook even a fancied insult. Still further, they find that the rod of power is passing from their hands into those of the party upon whom they have long looked with something like contempt. For nearly half a century the Southern aristocracy have been dominant in the Government of the United States. Rarely have their counsels been disregarded or their plans thwarted. They made war and peace at their pleasure, as witness the war of 1812, that with Mexico, and the Northern and Oregon boundary questions. They made and unmade Presidents, from John Quincy Adams to James Buchanan. They enacted and rescinded tariffs, in accordance with their own ideas of policy or interest. They established and repealed compromises, from the admisssion of the of Missouri to the rejection of Kansas. In a word, they were able, in various ways, to control the policy and shape the destiny of our Republic. But their eagerness to increase and perpetuate their power, at last, subverted it almost entirely. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the attempt to extend slavery over all the Territories, as well as to make it more secure in the free States, as indicated in Mr. Toombs' threat, to "call the roll of his slaves on Bunker Hill," was to much for the Northern love of freedom. The people began to rally as one man, to oppose these exactions. The Republican party sprang into existence, as if by magic. The Democratic party, so long dominant and sharing its power with its Southern allies, was suddenly paralyzed, and soon overpowered at almost every point in the North. The sagacious Southern politicians soon saw the ruin that was coming upon them, and that the control of the Federal Government would speedily be taken out of their hands. That acute man, John C. Calhoun, had foreseen something of this kind, as early as 1830, and under the influence of his personal disappointment, in his aspirations to the Presidency, broached the scheme of nullification, and finally developed the theory of secession. His fascinating genius speedily

gathered the ardent young politicians of the South around his standard. He established a new school, a Southern school in politics, and rapidly diffused his ideas through the Southern mind. His death made no difference, or rather extended the influence of his school, for those who had hitherto been pupils now became professors, and spread their influence from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. Antagonism between the North and the South was carefully cultivated. Love for the Union was systematically undermined and eradicated. The fundamental principles of democracy and republicanism, the doctrine of inalienable rights and of universal liberty and equality in the eye of the law, were denied and scouted. The dignity of labor and the duty of the Government to protect it by suitable tariffs were ridiculed and rejected. It became a maxim among them, that "the capitalist should own the laborer," and that no other system of society could succeed. Hence the free North was a government of anarchy, doomed to destruction, and the South, with its well organized system of slavery, had before it a most brilliant future, economical and commercial, as well as social and political. All the prosperity and wealth of Northern cities, were, by a new order of things, to be transferred to Charleston, Savannah and New Orleans, where "cotton was to be king," and sway his golden sceptre over a renovated land. Dreams of a great Southern empire took possession of their excited imaginations. Possessed of boundless wealth, prosperity and power, the whole continent of America was to be at their feet. But they were to turn away with contempt from the poor and frozen North, and extend their benignant sway over the sunny South. Mexico, Central America and the Pacific States were to be added to their sway, and a career of greatness was before them, to which the world had never seen a parallel. Intoxicated with these dreams, it is not so strange that they were somewhat reconciled to the idea of relinquishing their power in the old and, as they supposed, decaying Federal Union. Hence they took their measures for leaving it. If Mr. Fremont had been elected President, they would at once have set up the standard of revolt. But the administration of Mr. Buchanan was a golden opportunity for carrying out their purposes. How systematically the Southern leaders, who were installed in his administration, went to work, no one needs to be told. They did all that they could to disarm the General Government and the North. The great mass of its arms and mu-

nitions of war was sent to Southern fortresses, where they could easily be seized by the conspirators, whenever they were prepared to raise the standard of revolt. The army was scattered at intervals of thousands of miles, from Texas and New Mexico to Utah, California and Oregon, and in Texas surrounded by a hostile population that might easily overpower its isolated divisions. The navy was sent off to the most distant seas, from the North pole to the tropics, from Africa to China, where it would be least accessible and most difficult to recall. The officers of the army and navy were debauched in every possible way, and all the offices of Government, so far as possible, filled with men favorable to the designs of the conspirators. All the Legislatures and executive offices, in the Southern States, were filled with men favorable to their schemes. The election of Mr. Lincoln was to be the signal for the explosion of the mine and the outburst of the conspiracy. That election was certain, and the conspirators, by their action in the Democratic conventions, at Charleston and Baltimore, had assisted in making it doubly sure. No wonder, then, that they were prepared for the event, and that, at the word of command, one after another of the Southern States withdrew from the Union and took their places in the ranks of secession.

But there was one thing for which these shrewd politicians and wily conspirators were not prepared, namely, the innate love of liberty and justice in the great body of the American people, North and South, and their unwavering and unshakeable attachment to the Union, as the best means of securing and perpetuating their rights and liberties. Even in the South, where they had had such unrestricted opportunities for misleading and corrupting the public mind, and agitating and exciting it by sectional questions, and especially by the fear of interference with slavery by the North, even there they found it impossible at once to carry the great body of the people with them. It is doubtful whether a single State, with the exception of South Carolina, would have given a majority of the popular vote in favor of secession, and even there, we know that many of their strongest men and wealthiest planters and slaveholders, were utterly opposed to the idea. So also in all the other seceded States, from Virginia to Texas, notwithstanding the wild frenzy of the civil war into which they have been plunged, and the monstrous misrepresentations of Northern character, feelings and intentions, it is certain that the great body of all intelli-

gent and reflecting people prefer "the old Union" to any Confederacy that can be formed. Of this, the Union vote in Virginia and Tennessee, and the determined resistance of large sections of those States to the so-called acts of secession, by their Conventions or Legislatures, are conclusive evidence. That thousands, and tens of thousands, all over the South, are only waiting for the favorable moment to reassert their rights, and re-establish themselves in the Union, we have every reason to believe. The avowed preference of the South Carolina, and other secession leaders, for aristocratic and monarchical institutions, as presented in the recent developments of Mr. Russell, the well-known correspondent of the "London Times," and their anxiety for alliances with Great Britain and France, will increase the aversion of the popular mind to this whole movement, which is thus more clearly shown to be utterly subversive of our republican and democratic ideas.

But the action of the North is unmistakeable and conclusive in this matter. For a long time the great body of the people could not believe that there were any serious designs against their cherished principles and beloved institutions. They could not realize that the Union was in danger, and that their liberty was at stake. They thought that it was a mere quarrel of the politicians, such as they had long listened to; a question as to who should serve them and enjoy the emoluments of office. They were not so much surprised that South Carolina should secede, for she had attempted to do so, even when General Jackson was President. They were amazed to see Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas, following in the same mad career. But the first gun at Fort Sumter broke the spell. It awoke them to a consciousness of the true position of the South, warned them of the dangers that were upon them, and aroused them to a sense of their duty to act promptly and efficiently. That gun, which Beauregard fired, was like the blast of the bugle of which we are told in the Arabian legend, where the knights who had been changed into statues of stone by necromantic arts, suddenly awoke again to life, drew their swords and rushed into the conflict. Thus the whole body of Northern freemen at once sprang to arms as one man for the defence of their country and the preservation of its union. Party contests were immediately hushed, and the only question between Democrat and Republican, American and Foreigner was, who should most zealously and most

faithfully serve their country. At the first call of the President a million of men were ready to put themselves in arms, and the great strife was, who should go and who should stay at home. Fathers offered their sons, wives their husbands, maidens their lovers. Capitalists offered their money by millions, and the people were prepared to sacrifice property, the fruit of all their toils, their homes and all that they held dear, for the defence of that country and those principles, without which they were persuaded that their National Union, their liberty, their laws, good order and peace, the name and fame and glory of their land were gone forever. Never was there such an uprising, such enthusiasm and union of a people for the defence of their country and its institutions, within the memory of nations, or in the annals of all history.

And here we have our proof that a higher order of civilization and a purer and more practical Christianity than the world has ever before known, have opened upon us. There never was any army, that ever before went into the field, with such lofty principles and such clear and distinct ideas of the objects for which they are fighting, as that now arrayed under the banner of the United States, its stars and stripes. It is not personal ambition, it is not the love of war, it is not national antipathy that arrays our soldiers and carries them to the field of battle. It is unchangeable love of country, based upon approval of its institutions, attachment to the Union, as the great safeguard of liberty, and of all individual rights and social blessings; an abhorrence of injustice and oppression, and horror of anarchy and lawlessness. These soldiers will also be better equipped and provided for, morally as well as physically, than any troops that ever before entered the field. Cromwell's regiments, who had their Bibles and prayer-meetings, and preaching Colonels and praying Captains, and were commanded by their General to "*trust in God, and keep their powder dry,*" were furnished with all these things with much less care and success than are ours. That our soldiers will be armed with the best weapons that modern science can prepare, is a small part of their equipment. Their clothing, their provisions, their hospital stores and means of locomotion are such as have never before been equalled. Never has an army been so provided with devoted nurses, chaplains, Bibles, tracts, newspapers and everything that can fit them for death or prepare them for victory. We do not claim that there are any "saints" in their ranks, but we know that there are

thousands of Christian men, among both officers and soldiers, and that the great body of our armies, from Maine to Missouri, are prepared to die as martyrs in the holiest cause for which men have ever fought.

Nor is the result at all doubtful. Success, victory cannot fail to crown the arms of the Republic in this struggle. The Union must and will be preserved. Treason and rebellion must be put down. The men who have entered into this conspiracy, and brought about this terrible struggle, must be overthrown, and their destructive dogmas utterly exploded. Slavery must be put, where the fathers of the Republic and the Constitution which they framed, originally placed it, in the sure way of ultimate extinction. Even now it is evident that this war is only hastening the result. Slaves are declared "contraband of war," and are escaping, by thousands, from all parts of the South, whilst Maryland, Western Virginia and Missouri are quickened by half a century, perhaps, in their movements towards emancipation. Even if it were possible for a separation to take place, as we do not now think that it is, that event would only the more certainly secure these results. We are assured, however, that the issue of this struggle will only be more fully to unite our country, to put an end to its sectional strifes, to strengthen its central Government, to purify and invigorate its political principles, and to prepare it more fully for its great mission, as the representative of a true Christian civilization, genuine liberty, and the loftiest national character, which the progress of the human race has hitherto developed. We do not, therefore, look forward with apprehension, but with hope to the result of this struggle. Our nation has only to be true to itself, properly to use its resources and put forth its power, and the result can not be doubtful. We shall come forth from the ordeal of this battle, a more united, freer and more glorious nation than we have hitherto been.

# ARTICLE IX.

## HYMNS

### TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN.

By Rev. M. Loy, A. M., Delaware, Ohio.

### I.

*"Dir, dir, Jehovah! will ich singen."* *By B. Ceasselius*, † 1724.

To Thee, O Lord! will I sing praises,
  For where is found a glorious God like Thee?
To Thee my heart its anthem raises,
  O give thy quickening Spirit's aid to me,
That I may sing in Jesus' name alone,
In strains which find acceptance at Thy throne.

To Thy dear Son, O Father! lead me,
  That He again to Thee may lead my soul,
Thy Spirit in green pastures feed me,
  And all my powers of heart and mind control,
That I may always feel Thy holy peace,
And sing in praise of Thee and never cease.

Grant me, O Lord! this priceless treasure,
  Then shall my humble harpings grateful be;
Then beautiful will be the measure
  With which in heart and truth I worship Thee;
Then near to Thee Thy Spirit shall me bring,
And I a worthy psalm of praise shall sing.

For He can intercede with groanings,
  Which my poor tongue is powerless to express;
He comes to soothe my cheerless moanings,
  And with the prayer of faith my soul to bless:
Makes me joint-heir with Christ of wealth on high,
And bids me ever Abba, Father! cry.

Thine eye with tenderness beholds me,
  When by the Spirit's pow'r my cry ascends;
Thine arm with gentleness enfolds me,
  And all thy love to meet and bless me bends,
E'er ready all my wishes to fulfill,
Which upward rise according to Thy will.

And what to ask Thy Spirit teaches,
  Must ever with Thy holy will accord;
My soul in Jesus' name beseeches,
  And therefore wilt Thou every boon afford:
I am in Him Thine own dear child and heir,
And grace for grace receive to crown my pray'r.

How richly this assurance blesses!
  With comfort, peace and joy it fills my heart;
I know that Thou, whom faith addresses,
  Each needful gift wilt graciously impart:
And more than I can ask or understand
Thou showerest on me from Thy bounteous hand.

I ask in Jesus' name, believing,
  Who ever intercedes in heaven for me;
Through Him each perfect gift receiving,
  In whom is yea whate'er I ask of Thee:
How blest am I! my soul forever bless
The name of Him who grants such happiness!

## II.

*Laszt uns alle fröhlich sein," by Urban Langhauns † about* 1560.

(ADVENT.)

Let us all in God rejoice,
  Who is pleased to save us;
Let us praise with heart and voice,
  For His Son He gave us.

He descends to sorrows here
  As a servant lowly,
That in heaven we may appear
  Princes high and holy.

Wealth to give He poor became—
  Is not this a wonder!
Therefore let us praise His name
  While His grace we ponder.

Lord! this year Thy favor show,
  Banish sin and sadness:
All who fain would have it so
  Say Amen! with gladness.

III.

*"Jesus komm doch selbst zu min," by John Angelus,* 1677.

Jesus, Saviour! come to me,
Let me ever be with Thee—
Come and never more depart,
Thou who reignest in my heart.

Ever do I for Thee sigh,
Nothing else can satisfy,
Ever do I cry to Thee—
Jesus, Jesus! come to me.

Earthly joys can give no peace,
Ne'er can bid my longings cease;
Still to have my Jesus near,
This is all my pleasure here.

All that makes the angels glad,
In their garbs of glory clad,
Only fills me with distress,
If Thy presence do not bless.

Take Thou all away from me,
I shall still thus minded be:
Thou who madest me Thine own
Shalt be all my joy alone.

None shall claim my heart beside,
None but Jesus crucified:
Saviour! I am only Thine,
Other love shall ne'er be mine.

Thou alone, my God and Lord!
Art my glory and reward;
Thou hast bled for me and died,
I will be no other's bride.

Come, then, Lamb for sinners slain,
Come, relieve me of my pain:
Evermore I cry to Thee—
Jesus, Jesus! come to me.

Patiently I wait, and pray—
Jesus! do not say me nay—
That when death shall come to me,
Thou a Jesus near wouldst be.

# ARTICLE X.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Carmina Ecclesiæ.* A collection of sacred music, consisting of new, original and select Hymn Tunes, Anthems and Chants, adapted particularly to the Hymn-Book of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church service, and every occasion of public worship, Missionary and Temperance Anniversaries, revival seasons, etc. Also a collection of tunes adapted to the Hymns in the revised and enlarged Lutheran Sunday-School and Infant-School Hymn-Book. Edited by W. D. Rœdel, Principal of Wytheville Female College, Va. Baltimore: Published by T. N. Kurtz, 1861. This volume has been for some time before the public, but only recently have we had an opportunity of examining its contents. The title sufficiently explains the design of the work, and although its plan seems comprehensive, it is fully carried out, and in such a manner as to enhance the high reputation which the author possesses as a musician. It has been pronounced by competent judges, one of the best books of the kind for fulness and variety, for refined taste and devotional feeling, and for its general adaptation to the usual demands of public and social worship.

*Discourses on Sacramental Occasions.* By Ichabod S. Spencer, D. D.; with an introduction by Gardner Spring, D. D., New York. M. W. Dodd, 1861. These discourses, twenty-six in number, delivered on sacramental occasions, contain the results of Christian experience, gathered through many years' ministry, by one whose labors were most signally blessed in the exercise of the pastoral office. Those who have read Dr. Spencer's Sketches, will not be disappointed in a perusal of the present volume. The discourses are rich in thought and remarkable for simplicity of style and earnestness of appeal. They cannot fail to instruct and comfort the devout believer.

*The Prayer-Meeting.* By Rev. J. Few Smith, D. D., Philadelphia. This little work appeared, originally, in the pages of the *Evangelical Review*, and was read with interest. The author designs, in a practical manner, to show that the prayer-meeting is Scriptural and of great value to the Church. He also gives directions as to the manner of preparing for its services and conducting its devotions. It is a useful manual on the subject, and is marked by all the excellencies which characterize Dr. Smith's productions.

*Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository,* No. LXX, April, 1861, contains the following articles: The Cross in Nature, and Nature in the Cross. By Rev. E. Hitchcock, D. D. The Necessity of the Atonement. By Rev. D. T. Fisk. Epistola ad Rusticum apologetica. By L. Withington, D. D. Speculation and the Bible. By Jas. W. M'Lane, D. D. Exposition of Zechariah XIV. By Prof. John J. Owen, D. D. The Salvation of Infants. By Rev. A. Tobey. The Genealogy of Christ. By George M. Clelland. Editorial Correspondence. Notices of New Publications. This is a very interesting No. of this old and ably conducted periodical. The first article, by Dr. Hitchcock, is a very original attempt to prove that "The original constitution and natural

and moral history of this world, show it to have been created, fitted up, and intended, from the beginning, to be a theatre for the work of redemption." In other words, that the plan of redemption through Christ, is in accordance with the analogy of nature. It is an attempt to extend the principles laid down by Dr. Butler, in his Analogy, into the domain of Natural Science, and to show that the teachings of the material world, and especially of Geology, not only coincide with those of revelation on the great doctrine of the Atonement, but that they even prefigure it, and are based upon its anticipation. In doing this, Dr. Hitchcock very successfully meets many of the objections commonly urged against his geological conclusions by many timid friends of the Bible. In fact this article of Dr. H. is a very good reply to the objections made in Art. IV, (Speculation and the Bible) to the positions taken by Dr. Hitchcock and other geologists, of the school of Buckland and Chalmers, and Hugh Miller. Art. III is an apology for moderate Calvinism, the spirit of which may be gathered from the following extract: "Calvin has one fault: he makes sovereignty too absorbing. He was pressed to it by the reaction of the age. I have endeavored to preach a simpler gospel. I deny nothing in the old forms. I believe *all.* I have only made a different mixture. I have tried to give my hearers an ampler whole: God is sovereign; man is free." p. 335. Art. VI, on "The Salvation of Infants," is still more moderate Calvinism. We there (p. 385) have this confession: "There is some modification of theological belief and methods of reasoning, with the progress of time. The Calvinism of Calvin and Turretin, is not exactly the same as that of Jonathan Edwards and Joseph Bellamy. Still less is it the same as that of Timothy Dwight, or Nathaniel Emmons, of Andrew Fuller or Thomas Chalmers, of Edward D. Griffin or Leonard Woods. How large a departure constitutes an essential change, is a question about which men will differ; and they will disagree very much according to their estimate of the points of doctrine concerned." The writer, of course, maintains that all who die in their infancy are saved, but admits that this was not the original theory of Calvinism upon the subject. Prof. Owen's article upon Zechariah XIV, is a very decided argument against the views, commonly given, of that portion of the Bible, by Millenarians.

*The New Englander.* Vol. XIX. April, 1861. Contents: The Lives of the Haldanes, as illustrating the Rise of Congregationalism in Scotland. The Present Attitude of the Church towards Critical and Scientific Inquiry. The Acquisition of the Amoor; Missions in India; Motley's United Netherlands; The Pulpit; Guizot's General History of Civilization; George Muller and the Life of Trust; The Martyrs under Queen Elizabeth; Dr. Bushnell's Christian Nurture; Ralph Waldo Emerson on the Conduct of Life; Notices of Books.

*The Danville Quarterly*, March, 1861. Contents: The Relative Doctrinal Tendencies of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism in America; The Relation which Reason and Philosophy sustain to the Theology of Revelation; The Mystery of Inquiry; Our Country—its perils—its deliverances; Immortality of the Soul; Ulphilas—The Goths and their Language; Nature and Revelation in relation to the origin of our Conception of a God; Divine Sovereignty Manifested in Divine Predestination—the only security for the use and success of means; Critical Notices.

*American Theological Review*, July, 1861. Contents: Slavery among the Ancient Hebrews; Powell on the Evidences; The Unity of the

Human Race; Criticism of New Testament Texts; Renan on Job and Canticles; Fisher's Sermons and Addresses; The Codex Alexandrinus; The Anti-Nicene Trinitarianism; Theological and Literary Intelligence; Literary and Critical Notices of Books; News of the Churches and of Missions.

*Brownson's Quarterly Review*, July, 1861. Contents: Gioberti's Philosophy of Revelation; Avignon and the Schism; Catholic Polemics; The Great Rebellion; Sardinia and Rome.

The following pamphlets have been received, but the want of space forbids a notice of them in detail:

*The Faith once delivered to the Saints.* A sermon, preached at the opening of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Illinois, held at Shelbyville, Illinois, August 30th, 1860. By Rev. S. L. Harkey, President.

*Discourse on the Spiritual Worship of God;* Its nature, auxiliaries and impediments. Delivered before the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of West Pennsylvania, September 30th, 1860. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D.

*The Lutheran Church and Missions.* A discourse, delivered at Salem, Clarion Co., Pa., October 11th, 1860. By Rev. R. Hill, A. M., Pastor of First Evangelical Lutheran Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

*The Purposes of God in the American Union.* A sermon delivered in the English Lutheran Church, Cumberland, Md., on Thanksgiving-Day, November 29th, 1860. By Rev. A. J. Weddell, A. M.

A Sermon preached in the First Evangelical Lutheran Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Thanksgiving-Day, November 29th, 1860. By the Rev. R. Hill, A. M.

*Trembling for the Ark of God;* or, the Danger and the Duty of the Church in the Present Crisis. A sermon preached in the First Lutheran Church, Carlisle, Pa., Sunday evening, December 30th, 1860. By Rev. Jacob Fry, A. M.

Lecture on the Geology in the vicinity of Bloomfield. Delivered before the Bloomfield Literary Club, December 21st, 1860. By Rev. D. H. Focht, A. M.

*The Threatening Ruin of our Times, our Prospects and our Duty.* A discourse, delivered in St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia, on the occasion of the National Fast, January 4th, 1861. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.

*The Renovation of Politics.* A discourse delivered in St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Lionville, Pa., January 4th, 1861. Rev. Samuel Aughey, A. M., Pastor of the congregation.

*Perseverance in Study, the only way to the Attainment of Knowledge.* An address delivered at the Susquehanna Female College, February 6th, 1861. By Rev. D. H. Focht, A. M., Pastor of the Lutheran Church, New Bloomfield, Pa.

*A Brief Survey of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.* The substance of a discourse, preached in Pottsville, Pa., February 16th, 1861, at the consecration of the English Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Transfiguration. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.

*Government and Christianity.* A sermon for the times, preached in St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, May 5th, 1861. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.

## CONTENTS OF NO. L.


Article. Page

I. State of the Country—Question at Issue, 161
By H. S. Dickson, D. D., Lewisburg, Pa.

II. The Two Records of Creation; or the Bible and Geology, . . . . 173
By Rev. A. Essick, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

III. The Ministerial Office, . . . 299
By Rev. M. Loy, A. M., Delaware, O.

IV. A Bible Glossary, . . . . 248
By Rev. J. B. Bittinger, A. M., Cleveland, O.

V. Exposition of Matt. XIX: 24, . . 264

VI. Theses upon the Church, . . . 267
Translated by Rev. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M. Professor in Pennsylvania College.

VII. The Nature of Ordination, . . . 292
By Rev. R. A. Fink, A. M., Lewisburg, Pa.

VIII. Hymn from the German, . . . 307
By Rev. M. Sheeleigh, Philadelphia, Pa.

IX. Notices of new Publications, . . 308
Motley's Netherlands.
Harpers' Classical Series.
Maclay's Life among the Chinese.
Cases of Conscience.
American Tract Society's Publications.
American Sunday School's Publications.

The first number of the thirteenth volume of the Evangelical Review has been received, and well sustains its character. We have called the attention of our ministers and laity to this important Magazine on so many different occasions, that we refer to it specially at present, only to urge to increased activity on its behalf, in view of its heavy losses by the stoppage of the Southern mails. It fills a want in the Church, which can be supplied in no other way.—*Missionary*, (*Pittsburg.*)

This work has for its object the commendable purpose of cultivating a Lutheran Theology and Literature in the English language. The importance and influence of the Lutheran Church in this country are not so generally known as they should be, from the fact, that, until a comparatively recent date, its ministers and people have clung so tenaciously to the tongue of the fatherland. As the prejudices against the use of the English language have died away among them, they have not only been brought more into contact with other denominations, but have caught more of the fire and life of Western progress. There is probably no denomination of Christians in the United States, at this time, that is making a more decided and healthful progress than this venerable Church. Of the Review we take pleasure in speaking in terms of commendation. It deserves the patronage not only of Lutherans, but of others, as an able and enlightened organ of public opinion.—*Sunday School Times*, (*Phil.*)

The Evangelical Review, with this number, enters upon the thirteenth volume. The Senior Editor, who has been connected with the Review almost from its commencement, has withdrawn from active editorial service. The two remaining editors, Dr. Reynolds and Prof. Stoever, announce, that the Review will be conducted by them in the same spirit as heretofore, and if we may judge by this number, there will be no decline in the skilful editorial management. The article on the National Crisis, is able, vigorous and patriotic.—*The Methodist*, (*N. York.*)

The first number of the thirteenth volume of this interesting periodical which has made its quarterly visits to us for the last twelve years, has just made its appearance. It has been edited by Rev. Dr. Krauth, Rev. Dr. Reynolds and Prof. Stoever, for a number of years past, with marked ability, and has had a strong influence in defence of the doctrines of the Church, and in elevating its character. We regret to learn that the venerable Senior Editor, Dr. Krauth, from impaired health, has withdrawn from active editorial service. He leaves behind him in the Editorial corps two very worthy men, who have talent and energy to render the Review highly interesting.—*Adams Sentinel*, (*Gettysburg.*)

The *Evangelical Review*, published at Gettysburg, contains the following: German Emigration to North America—an interesting subject treated with much research and ability; Jephthah's Vow; M. Minucii Felix Octavius; Annotations on Matt. xxiv. This is a specimen chapter of a forthcoming commentary. We hope to notice it again; The Races of Man in English History; Beneficiary Education. The next article, entitled, Theses upon the Church, requires more thorough criticism than we can give it at present. The number closes with translations of German Hymns, and Notices of New Publications. But these are preceded by an article on our National Crisis, which concludes with a fine tribute to the army.—*Independent*, (*N. York.*)

All the articles are marked with merit.—*The Standard*, (*Phil.*)

# THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. L.

OCTOBER, 1861.

## ARTICLE I.

### STATE OF THE COUNTRY—QUESTION AT ISSUE.

By H. S. Dickson, D. D., Lewisburg, Pa.

The position occupied by our Christian brethren, in the Seceding States, with reference to the controversy now submitted to the decision of arms, surprises and pains us. We are surprised that men, distinguished alike for intellectual culture and devoted piety, should advocate rebellion against the existing Government of these United States; use whatever influence they possess to plunge the nation into all the horrors of civil war, without any adequate or justifying cause. The only explanation we can give of this strange anomaly, is to be found in their peculiar views concerning the nature and powers of the General Government. They contend that our Government is nothing more than a confederacy, or compact between sovereign and independent States, possessing only such powers and privileges as these States may have seen fit to delegate, and liable at all times to be modified and annulled at the will of any one of the contracting parties. In other words, that each State is sovereign, possessing inherent and underived powers, part of which it may delegate to an agent, always, however, reserving to itself the right to resume, at will, whatever of power it may at any time have conferred.

Now, if this is a correct view of the nature and powers of the Government of these United States, it is evident that our brethren in the South cannot be chargeable with the sin of rebellion when they attempt to resume those rights and pow-

ers which belong to them, as sovereign States, and which they never intended to alienate. But this we shall endeavor to show, is the grand error which has been diligently inculcated throughout our entire country, but especially in the Southern part of it, during the past thirty years, with the express intention of producing the present result.

To this end, we must carefully examine the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of these United States, since they belong to each other of right. The one being the foundation and the other the coping of our present political edifice, which cannot be understood if the former is rejected or ignored.

It is, therefore, important to observe, in the very outset, that this Declaration was drawn up by the representatives of the people of the thirteen oppressed Colonies and, on the Fourth of July, 1776, proclaimed to the world, in the name and by the authority of said people, to be their act and Declaration. It was indeed a sublime act. There is nothing like it in the history of nations. It rests the rights and authority of government on an entirely new basis, the consent of the governed. We are, consequently, to remember that it was the people of the dependent Colonies of Great Britain who made this Declaration of Independence. The motive, influencing them thereto, was, on its face, avowed to be a decent respect for the opinions of men; its purpose, to declare the causes which impelled them to separate themselves from the community and Crown of the British Nation. And having done this, they announced their separate and equal station among the powers of the earth, to which the laws of nature, and of nature's God, entitled them under the name and title of the "United States of America."

But as preliminary to the causes of separation, and as the firm basis of the political edifice which they were now about to raise, they set forth as self-evident truths, the rights of individual man, by the laws of nature and of nature's God, to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness; that all men were created, and intended of God, to possess and enjoy equal political rights; that to secure these rights to each, Governments were instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. But this presupposes the existence of God, man's reponsibility to Him, a revealed law of right and wrong, and that Government is Divinely ordained for the securing of the aforesaid ends. "Appealing, therefore, to the Supreme Judge of the world

for the rectitude of our intentions, we do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these United Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, to make peace, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may, *of right*, do."

Let us, therefore, remember that this Declaration was made, not only in the name and by the authority of the people of the United Colonies, but that they did not, and never intended, to declare *each Colony free and independent.* On the contrary, the whole people declared the Colonies, in their *united condition*, free and independent. The independence of *each State was never declared* of right. *It never existed in fact.* National powers and rights belonged exclusively to, and were exercised exclusively by the people, in their united condition.

This, then, was what the people did on the Fourth day of July, 1776. They declared that the people of the thirteen Colonies were a *nation*, and that, as such, they were, by the laws of nature and of nature's God, invested with all the rights and privileges of nationality. To make good their claim, they appealed to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, for the rectitude of their intentions, and took up the sword against the most warlike and powerful nation on the globe. At length peace came; the battle was ended and the victory won. The United Colonies were acknowledged to be a nation by the great powers of the earth. But, amid the carnage and blood of the Revolution, it was impossible to carry forward the political edifice commenced on the Fourth day of July, 1776. With the return of peace, however, the people resumed the great work. A convention of delegates, from all the States, met in Philadelphia, on the thirteenth of May, 1787. The Constitution of the United States was their work. At the head of this convention was George Washington, in whose character the spirit of command and of meekness were combined and exemplified in such perfection, that we can find no parallel in the uninspired history of the human family. Among its members were Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, James Madison, Robert Morris, Alexander Hamilton, and all the others, without exception, had occupied some important position, in the council or field, during the war of Independence. The Constitution was, by this convention, reported to Congress, then sitting in New York,

on the 17th day of September, 1787, and was by Congress adopted, on the 17th day of the same month, and sent to the people of the several States, to be by them ratified, or rejected. It having been adopted by them as their own work, after mature deliberation, Congress appointed the first Wednesday in January, 1789, for the election of President and Vice-President of the United States, under said Constitution, when it appeared, on counting the votes, that George Washington was chosen President, and John Adams Vice-President. The new Congress assembled on the 4th of March, 1789, and on the 30th of April following, was consummated the great work, commenced on the 4th of July, 1776, George Washington being then inaugurated President of the United States, under the Constitution.

Thus, on this ever-to-be-remembered day, the 30th of April, 1789, was this mighty revolution, not only in the affairs of our own country, but in the principles of government over civilized man, fully accomplished. But it was the work of thirteen years; the Revolution did not terminate until the Constitution was adopted by the people, and the oath to support it administered to George Washington. Then our political edifice was complete, the key-stone was in its place, and it, therefore, withstood the tide of revolution, which swept the oldest and proudest monarchies of Europe away. This is the rich legacy which our fathers left us, with their dying injunction, that we would "preserve, protect and defend it;" and pass it down to posterity, not a pillar defaced, not a stone misplaced, not a light broken, or even marred, but standing out in all the glory of its original beauty, as the sanctuary of the oppressed from every clime.

The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence speaks one and the same language, they are parts of one consistent whole. They are both put forth in the name and by the authority of the *people* of the United States. In their *united condition* they proclaim themselves free and independent, with *mutual pledges of perpetual union.* Their rights are the common rights of mankind. But it was only for themselves, in their united condition, that they claimed the right to exercise supreme power. Sovereignty belonged to them, not as States, but as united States. "It is obviously impracticable, said Washington, in the Federal Government of these States, to secure all the rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all." Hence the Constitution speaks in the name

of the people, the source of all just authority in the State: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the Uuited States of America." Thus this Constitution became, so soon as it was adopted, the supreme law of the land. It was no compact or agreement between States, which might be annulled at the pleasure of the parties concerned, or by its own limitation. It is, on the contrary, the embodied power of the people; it is supreme, because they have so willed it; it is perpetual, for the same reason, and cannot be changed or modified, by any power on earth, except that of the people, and only by them in the manner which they have clearly defined; it can only be annulled or abolished, then, by the people, in a regular and lawful manner, or by armed and successful rebellion of a part against the whole.

The right of secession is, consequently, an absurdity. There is nothing in the Declaration of Independence, nothing in the Constitution, nothing in the administration of the early Presidents from which it can derive the slightest sanction or support. The United States is *a nation*, and not a confederacy of States. It derives its power directly from the people, whose united sovereignty it represents, and in their name and by their authority, declares that "any law or regulation passed by any State, inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, is null and void." Sovereignty belongs *only* to the people in their *united condition*; it is the distinguishing attribute of nationality. To talk, therefore, of State sovereignty, when every man knows that no State in this Union ever possessed the right to exercise supreme power, is a gross abuse of language, intended often, we doubt not, to impose upon the unthinking.

But for thirty years, false principles, in reference to the nature and powers of our Government, have been inculcated, in order to prepare the way for the present rebellion; principles at war with those enunciated in the Declaration of Independence.

There are those among us who have denied the natural equality and inalienable rights of man, who have denied that the people are the only rightful source of power in the State, that the just powers of the Government are derived from the

consent of the governed. Every one of these principles, which the framers of our Constitution considered the only basis on which a free Government could rest, every one of them has been discarded or ignored by our brethren of the Southern Confederacy, in their Declaration of Independence.

By some they have been called "glittering generalities," by others, "the spawn of an Infidel or Atheistic Philosophy, which tends to overthrow both religion and civilization."

"I deny," said the great statesman of the South, a few years before his decease, "I deny the assertions of the Declaration of Independence. Men are not born, children are born, they are not born equal, for some weigh ten pounds and a half at birth, whilst others weigh but seven. Some are white and others black. Some are the inheritors of disease and early death, and others of health and strength, both of body and mind." Are the immortal truths of our Declaration to be set aside by such puerilities? And shall we prove faithless to the trust committed to our care, and allow this temple of liberty to be overthrown, and one raised upon its ruins, with human slavery for its chief corner-stone? No, never! In the words of "the noblest Roman of them all," we swear by Him that liveth forever, "The Union must and shall be preserved." Secession must and shall be put down. It strikes at the life of the nation, and, if successful, must introduce disorder and misrule and anarchy, from which our only refuge would be an unpitying despotism.

The right of Secession is the right of a minority to destroy our nationality, to trample upon our Constitution, which all have sworn to protect and defend. This cannot be allowed. Nothing is so dear to a people as their national life, and its extinction is, to a free Christian people, a greater calamity than all others which can befall them this side the grave. "For there is hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease," but a dead nation has no resurrection. It sinks in sleep profound; a long, unconscious, never ending sleep. Better, then, that every brave man among us should perish, in the trench, or in the open field, than that rebellion should be successful. For secession is rebellion and nothing else.

We do not say that it may not be wise, at some future time, to change the Constitution in some of its non-essential features, to contract or expand our territorial limits; but whatever change is made, should be made in a lawful and orderly manner. After armed rebellion has been put down

and the flag of our Union waves proudly on every fortress and in every town, from Maine to the Rio Grande, and from sea to sea, then will be the time to deliberate as to the changes which can be safely and wisely made.

We have said that throughout our entire history, the people, in their united condition, have claimed and exercised supreme power, but the Government which they have adopted is the only rightful expression of that supremacy. Its voice is, for the time being, the voice of the people, and we have the highest authority for saying, that the voice of the people, when thus expressed, is the voice of God. Romans 13 : 1. In sustaining the Government, therefore, we sustain the supremacy of the people; in opposing it, in the just exercise of all its Constitutional power, we oppose the supremacy of the people, we consequently renounce the principles of the old Democracy, repudiate the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence, and are, in fact, what we have not the courage to avow, seceders, "backsliders in heart."

We say, then, that the men, to whom the people have, for the time being, intrusted the Government, must and shall be sustained in the exercise of their Constitutional rights and powers. If we cannot surrender our personal and party prejudices, and come up courageously to the support of the Government, when its very existence is imperiled, we are the degenerate sons of noble sires, unworthy of the inheritance which they left. We do not ask any one to become a Republican—we do not ourselves adopt that party name—we only ask that we, as American freemen, receive and act upon the principles of the *old Democracy* of Jefferson and Jackson—principles which have stood the test of time, which were announced to an oppressed world by such thinkers and actors and preachers, as John Locke, William the Silent, Martin Luther, John Calvin; and fifteen hundred years before they were born, by Paul, the apostle, and Jesus of Nazareth. For Christianity is the root of all Democracy, the highest fact in the rights of man. It recognizes no aristocracy of blood or birth, of class or office. It claims for man justice and equality. It claims that man, as man, as a citizen, a husband and a parent, is the peer of every other man, and this it rests on an impregnable basis—the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. "God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the whole earth."

"Oh, first-born of love and light,
  Yet bending brow and look severe
On all which pains the holy sight,
  Or wounds the pure and perfect ear.
Through all disguise, form, place or name,
  Beneath the flaunting robes of sin,
Through poverty and squalid shame,
  Thou lookest on *the man* within;
On man, as man, retaining yet,
  Howe'er debased, and soiled, and dim,
The crown upon his forehead set—
  The immortal gift of God to him."

Are we ready, then to discard the essential principles of a God-given democracy, to deny the right of the people to govern themselves? Shall we sustain the Government which they have established, the only channel through which their supremacy can now justly and legally manifest itself?

Let us remember that the very object of the patriots of the Revolution, in adopting the Constitution, was "to *form a more perfect union*," to discard the old Confederacy, which was an essential departure from the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and which had brought us to the very brink of ruin, and to form one nation out of many States. They rested it on human rights, responsibility to God, and the consent of a majority of the people. They made it supreme in reference to all matters of common concern: such as the establishment of justice, the insurance of domestic tranquility, the promotion of the common defence of the general welfare, the securing of the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity."

Hence the Constitution and laws of the United States became the supreme law of the land. Members of Congress, members of the several State Legislatures, all executive and judicial officers of the United States, and of the several States, were bound to take an oath to support the Constitution and laws of the General Government, "anything in the Constitutions or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding."

The right, then, of any State to secede, or to annul the laws of the General Government is too absurd for any further argument. Upon this subject, the language of Henry Clay finds a response in the breast of every intelligent and honorable man: "I owe *supreme allegiance* to the General Government, and to my State a *subordinate one.*"

This is the teaching, as we have already seen, of the Declaration of Independence, which declared the United Colonies, in their united condition, free and independent. It is the teaching of the Constitution which gave legal form and political effect to the previously accepted truths, and of James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and of that glorious old hero, Andrew Jackson, whose only dying regret was, that he did not hang the real author of this present rebellion, John C. Calhoun. They all maintained that there need be no conflict between the General and State Governments, that each had its own well defined sphere, in which it was supreme, but that, if a conflict should arise, if the State should attempt to exercise any attribute of nationality, to declare war, to coin money, to regulate commerce, or to do any act or thing which a nation alone can do, its declarations and laws upon these subjects were to be treated as null and void, and if it proceeded, by force, to execute them, it was to be treated as in rebellion, which the entire power of the General Government must be called upon to suppress. The President is sworn to do this, before entering upon the duties of his high office, and the same imperative obligation is laid upon the conscience of every inferior officer, throughout the entire country.

Thus stands the right. No proposition in Euclid is capable of clearer demonstration than this—Secession is treason, and those who take up arms against the Government ought to be punished with death.

But the real bond which is to re-unite and perpetuate this Union, is not simply *right*, but right and love united.

If the affections of the people of these States have been finally alienated, if the fraternal spirit must now give way to malignant hatred, the political bonds that have heretofore united us, will be snapt asunder, as tow before the fire, and our Government will drift helplessly forward before the storms of human passion, until, finally, it perishes in the quicksands of anarchy, overwhelmed by the waves of popular delusion, which it could neither control nor resist. Those, therefore, at the North or the South, who have sought to alienate one section of our common country from another, are the real authors of our present calamities; the sin of disunion lies at their door. Ambitious demagogues would have been utterly powerless, had not the flame of sectional hatred been kindled by others.

Against all this, Washington left us a timely warning: "The unity of Government, which constitutes you one people, is the main pillar in the edifice of your real independence. . . It is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperty; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties that now link together the various parts."

Here we must humbly confess that we are guilty. We have not indignantly frowned upon the attempts of corrupt or foolish men to alienate one section of our country from the rest; in the madness of zeal, even good men have aided and abetted these attempts. With the local affairs and institutions of other States, we had no right to interfere; our souls could not be burdened with their sins; so that we had neither excuse nor palliation for obtruding our opinions upon those who did not seek them. My neighbor may govern and instruct his family much better than I do, but that gives him no right to enter my dwelling and interfere with my authority. This, however, is just what we of the North have been, for years, seeking to do. We have allowed ourselves to indulge in an intermeddling censorious spirit, in regard to our brethren of the South, for which we have neither excuse nor palliation.

But surely this intermeddling spirit, which was characteristic of only a small portion of our population, could, in no way, justify rebellion against the Government, in which all had a common interest, and which extended to each section the most complete protection and the largest possible liberty consistent with the well-being of the whole. If our Southern brethren had grievances, there was a legal and orderly way of having them redressed. The Government was in their own hands, and had been since its foundation. If the Constitution worked in any way to their disadvantage, they could have appealed to the people for a change or modification in that particular respect. The fact, however, was that they had no real grievance which Government could redress;

they did not even pretend to have any, but such as grew out of the institution of slavery. And here they make four points, on every one of which they are in the wrong. They complained that the General Government, after it had passed into the hands of their political enemies, might interfere with slavery in the States; but the last Congress, by a nearly unanimous vote, passed a law, declaring that the Government had no right to interfere with slavery in the States where it existed, and sent this down to the people of the States, to be by them made an irrepealable proviso of the Constitution. They claimed the right to carry their slaves with them, into all our Territories, and to hold them there as property, and the Supreme Court decided, whether right or wrong, we will not now stop to examine, that they had that right under the Constitution, and the Government stood ready to protect them in the enjoyment of it, to the fullest extent. They claimed the right to recover their fugitive slaves escaping into free States; but it is the testimony of men of the highest standing, in all parties, that the Fugitive Slave Law was never so well executed, since the foundation of the Government, as during the past ten years. They complained that the Northern people continued to discuss the subject of slavery, through the press and in the pulpit; but the Constitution which we all adopted, expressly declared that "Congress shall make no law abridging the liberty of speech, or of the press." The founders of our Government believed that "Error might be left free, if truth were left free to combat it;" and that any institution which could not bear to be discussed freely and publicly, in the forum and in the press, *ought to perish.*

This rebellion, then, has nothing to justify or palliate the enormity of its criminality. If we measure the guilt of the chief actors, by the good endangered, or sought to be destroyed, and the fact that it is without any justifying cause, it cannot be surpassed by all the atrocities of rebellion and murder that have degraded the annals of the race since the world began.

This is, consequently, the conclusion to which all the facts in the case force us. A few unprincipled men have precipitated most of the Southern States into rebellion. The most momentous contest that the world ever saw, has been forced upon us. The life of the greatest and freest of the nations is at stake. If we prove unequal to the trust committed to us, it will die and be buried deep where no resurrection voice

will ever reach it. This is already the language of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs: "Your Republic is dead and it is the last the world will ever see!" "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph."

Shall we, then, endeavor to avert this great catastrophe by a compromise? This would be most desirable were it possible. But there is really nothing to compromise. There is, as we have seen, no real grievance to be redressed; and the sole object of the revolution, as avowed by its leaders, is the dismemberment or overthrow of the Government. Consequently no compromise is possible with these men, that would look to the preservation of the integrity of these United States. Shall we, then, acknowledge their independence? In other words, shall we imbrue our hands in our country's blood, and to escape a contest forced upon us, commit national suicide? No, the coward who is ready for this has lived too long.

Let us, then, arm for the contest. Let us encourage and sustain our rulers to the full extent of our ability, that they may be what God intended they should be, *a terror to evil-doers*. The battle *is ours*, and we will raise high the flag of our country, the symbol of resistless power, Union and victory. We will gather inspiration from its history. It has waved triumphant over the snows of Canada, the sands of Mexico, and on the bosom of every ocean, since first thrown to the breeze, over the bloody but glorious field of Saratoga; nor will we ever allow it to be trampled in the dust by rebel feet and ruffian bands. With a firm trust in our fathers' God, we will fight for the Government, the Constitution and Liberty, and if our country must perish, we will make her last end worthy of her glorious life.

> "So let it be. In God's own might
> We gird us for the coming fight."

The late disaster will only nerve a million hearts to risk their all upon the battle-field. "*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.*" "Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let the weak say, I am strong;" and with a firm and unyielding trust in Him "to whom the shields of the earth belongeth," let us move quietly forward to victory or death. If we cannot preserve our liberties we can each fill a brave man's grave.

# ARTICLE II.

## THE TWO RECORDS OF CREATION; OR, THE BIBLE AND GEOLOGY.

Rev. A. Essick, A. M., Gettysburg, Pa.

We have been deeply interested, and highly delighted, in tracing out the two-fold manner in which God has seen fit to reveal Himself. Scarcely any fact in the sacred record stands alone, but each is connected, as type, or anti-type, with some other fact. We have the patriarch preparing to deliver up his son, and God actually delivering His. We have Moses in the old Church and Christ in the new; the burning bush in the one, and the tongue of fire in the other; the Paschal Lamb, recalling scenes of deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and the Lamb of God delivering from the bondage of sin. Most of the prophecies have a two-fold import, an immediate and a remote fulfilment—the one symbolic of the other. The Prophet is inspired to record events impending under his own observation, or that of his cotemporaries, and these in turn become prophecies of other events, whose scenes are laid in distant ages. The tumult raised against the regal advancement of David, has its parallel in hostility against Christ. The withdrawal of the Divine presence from the Psalmist, in his extremity, is re-enacted in the case of the suffering Saviour on the cross. Sometimes the two events, contained in the prophecy, are so united as scarcely to admit of distinct interpretations. What is foretold concerning the destruction of the temple and the end of the world, is so blended as to make it impossible to separate the parts of which the predictions are composed, so as to refer them with any certainty. In fact, they must not be separated, but studied together as complements of each other. They are united, as the invisible in the visible, as spirit in body and God in man.

Rising from things special to things general, we find that God has made a two-fold revelation of Himself, *in His Word, and in His works.* Much of what He has written in the Old Testament and the New, has been engraven, for illustration, in "the heavens and the earth." The sidereal map

serves to guide the eye in tracing the glowing descriptions of the pen of inspiration, and the foot-prints of the Creator, preserved in the solid rock, establish the outgoings of His Providence, as they are registered on the sacred page. We must study the two records. The student of the Bible must also be a student of Nature. Say not, "Here is Christ, or there!" Behold, he is everywhere, above, beneath, around and in us. His word reveals, and His works praise Him. Let us learn to trace Him in both.

What a profound and interesting subject for contemplation is this earthly ball of ours. Its origin, structure, history and destiny, have exercised and puzzled the wisest heads, in all time. Great as has been the diversity of minds, so great have also been the diversity of feelings and sentiments with which it has been viewed by the countless thinkers that have trodden its surface, or now sleep in its bosom. Some fortunate ones have spent their allotted time here, with all the innocent mirth and happiness of a child in its mother's lap, and then have fallen gently asleep in her embrace, to be awaked only in the event of the resurrection of the dead and the restitution of all things. These have known nought of their mother, save her kindness, and have died ignorant, alike of her history and her lineage. Others have mourned, as pilgrims here, wept continually tears of bitter sorrow, sighed and left the world sighing beneath the cloud. For them the cloud had no "silver lining," and the earth no soft verdure. They came in the twilight, and went while it was yet dark. To the mere sentimentalist, the world is all beauty, a perfect paradise of matchless scenery, canopied by an enchanting panorama of glittering stars and burning suns. He is enraptured with its venerable woods and smiling meadows, its majestic rivers and babbling brooks; its mountains and plains, its flowers and fruits, the singing of its birds and the sighing of its zephyrs. He rather admires than reads the book of Nature, and is more pleased with its gilded binding than its sacred contents. To the materialist, who dwells mournfully upon the past, this beautiful world becomes only a charnel house for the dead. In his creed the lamp of life, once extinguished, will never be lighted again, and the soul, being itself a part of the body, has gone to its final resting place, never to be re-animated.

To the man of science, the earth is a book of facts, where the crystal and the massive rock have recorded their own history, with the history of cotemporary animal and vegeta-

ble life—a series of causes and effects, binding the present with the most distant past, and making all originate from the Great First Cause and depend upon Him. The man of science cannot be an atheist—an infidel he may be. But it is to the Christian philosopher alone, that the world unfolds, without reservation, its treasures of beauty and wisdom. He interrogates nature with the Bible in hand. He approaches this store-house of facts, with the key which heaven has furnished. If he makes either, his text book, he employs the other as its commentary, and regards both as proceeding from the same source. He may fail to decipher with complete accuracy the characters in which either is written; his attempts to harmonize them may not always be successful, but he is sure there can be no real conflict. The difficulty is not in the things recorded, but in reading them correctly. We wish it to be clearly understood that this is the only principle upon which we would venture to consult the Two Records. They are not books written on opposite sides of a controversy, but proofs from different stand-points, tending to the same conclusion.

The history of interpretation, perhaps, furnishes no diversities so startling and contradictory, as those set forth with regard to the Mosaic record of creation. The record itself, exceedingly brief, and clothed in language as variously interpreted as even the "Testimony of the Rocks," has left an open field for speculation. Philology and science, friends naturally, and capable of rendering each other important service, have been provoked to mutual hostility. The mere philologist, who has never learned even the alphabet of nature, apprehends a purpose, on the part of his supposed antagonist, to silence the voice of inspiration, and, therefore, decries science. The student of Nature, on the other hand, through ignorance of the Bible, retaliates by setting aside the record of Moses. Forces, that should attract, are thus made to repel each other, and a marvellous "confusion of tongues" is the consequence. But Geology stands not alone in this singular attitude. Astronomy had to pass a similar ordeal. The "heavens" as well as the "earth" were refused audience in the narrative of their own creation. He who looked, through his telescope, out upon the great abyss, for chance fragments of truth, and he who dug down into the earth for treasures of "hidden wisdom," have been thrust out of the Synagogue for presumption. Until the time of Copernicus, it was universally believed that the earth stood still

while the sun revolved around it. The contrary doctine was deemed unscriptural. "*God has established the foundations of the earth, so that they cannot be removed forever.*" So said the Psalmist; and this was thought to settle the controversy. The theologians of the day were intolerant, and branded with sacrilege any attempt to despoil the temple of God of this established truth. To them the earth was firmly fixed under their feet, while the sun, moon and stars evidently moved around in their orbits. Galileo embraced the doctrine of Copernicus, defended and proved it, and then, under compulsion, recanted on his knees. The earth moved and science advanced, nevertheless. Francis Turretin, a distinguished Protestant theologian, whose writings still hold a prominent place in some of the first schools of theology, entered into an elaborate argument, to disprove the dangerous presumptions of science against the authority of the Bible. He propounds the inquiry, "Do the sun and moon move in the heavens and revolve around the earth, while the earth remains at rest?" He proceeds to establish the affirmative of this, by arguments drawn from the Bible, such as these: "The sun is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race;" "The sun knoweth his going down;" "The sun also ariseth and the sun goeth down: The sun, by a miracle, stood still in the time of Joshua, and went back in the time of Hezekiah: "The world also is established that it cannot be removed forever," etc. On the ground of philology alone, no interpreter of Scripture could resist the conclusion. Regarding the Bible as the exponent of *real* truth, where it represented only what is *apparent*, it is no matter of wonder that its friends trembled in anticipation of the dreaded innovations of science. "The times of this ignorance God winked at," but now has set to His seal that this newly discovered luminary, the light of science, is also one of the lights of heaven, and that it may move among the others without contravening the pathway of any.

The difficulties which it is proposed to clear away so as to bring the Two Records into harmony, may be stated as follows:

1. It has generally been believed, until recently, that Moses fixes the origin of the universe, designated as "the heavens and the earth," no further back than about six thousand years—that his brief narrative comprehends all the changes which the earth has undergone, and all the organic beings,

animal and vegetable, that have existed since the beginning, and that the entire work of Creation was completed in six natural days, of twenty-four hours each. In other words, a literal interpretation is insisted on.

2. On the other hand, those who are concerned for the harmony of the Two Records, insist upon a free rendering of Moses, in accordance with principles of exegesis admitted in other portions of the Bible. The facts of Geology, as understood at present, seem to render the conclusion inevitable, that the materials of the globe must be many times more ancient than six thousand years—that the changes which have evidently taken place on the globe since its formation, if they occurred in accordance with laws now in operation, (which is most probable,) must have required a much longer period than has been ascribed to the account of Moses—that the plants and animals, whose remains are imbedded in the lower strata of rocks, could not have been cotemporary with those now existing, and that six natural days, of twenty-four hours each, are altogether inadequate, according to the laws of nature now operating, to the production of all the changes which are found to have taken place since the creation of the materials of the globe.

These are the Two Records, as interpreted respectively by the student of the Bible and the man of science. If the respective interpretations are correct, there is manifestly a contradiction. This contradiction gives rise to an "irrepressible conflict," which never can be settled, until either Moses or the men of science have left the field. There can be no compromise between truth and error. If the one is right, the other, should he teach the contrary doctrine, must assuredly be wrong. We will see, in the sequel, whether these rivals, however misrepresented occasionally by their overzealous adherents, are not both loyal to Him, who in the beginning created the heavens and the earth.

It would be impossible, in the brief space of a single article, to set forth all the proofs on which Geologists rely for their doctrine of the great antiquity of the earth. The conclusion is based on facts, which need only the aid of a skillful interpreter. Time has left his footprints in the solid rock, which neither prejudice can obliterate nor scepticism gainsay. Guided by the finger of unerring wisdom, the oak keeps a register of its years, and under direction of the same power, the earth records its own annals. The antiquarian,

plodding among the alcoves of nature, with his geological hammer, discovers volume after volume of the mighty history, treasured in this great Museum of the world since time began. We are not driven to speculation here; we need no wings of a prophet, to carry us back to creation's dawn. All we want is a master to open the book and read it.

It is ascertained that the rocks * containing the remains of plants and animals, are, in many places, as much as six or seven miles in thickness. It is clearly evident that these rocks, consisting of hundreds of strata of different kinds of materials, have been formed by the agency of water, usually at the bottom of the ocean, by processes similar to those going on at the present time. Solid rocks, at great depths, are found to contain countless numbers of shells and remains of other marine animals. Allowing these rocks to have been formed, as they evidently were, by a deposition of sediment, or the remains of minute animals, in the way rocks are forming at the bottom of the ocean now, (or even at a much more rapid rate,) it would require, instead of six thousand years, myriads of ages to account for them. Sir Charles Lyell, during his visit to this country, a few years ago, obtained data, from which he drew the conclusion that the bed of the whole Mississippi valley, was formed, as the delta of the river is now forming, by drift. From these data (the figures of which it is not necessary to state) he calculated the time necessary to make all the deposits, at not less than sixty-seven thousand years. The same author computes the time during which the Niagara river wore its channel from Queenstown to the present falls, at the rate of one foot per year, which gives about thirty-five thousand years. Professor Agassiz, in his Lectures on the Florida Reefs, stated that he had ascertained, by observations and comparisons, that the reefs grew one foot in a hundred years. They are the production of the exceedingly minute coral insect, whose labors require immense periods to make any visible progress. By estimating the number and extent of these reefs, comprising the peninsula, he supposes that small tongue of land to be one hundred thousand years old. These are but a specimen of the facts relied upon to prove the great antiquity of the globe. For a full discussion of them we must refer our readers to the works written on the subject. There is anoth-

* The term *rock*, in Geology, is used in a general sense, to describe any kind of deposit, and is hence applied indiscriminately to what are called, in common language, sand, clay, limestone, quartz, drift, etc.

er class of facts to which we will barely allude here. The remains of plants and animals, excepting in the upper strata, are of entirely different species from those on the globe now. Many of them are altogether unlike any known to naturalists of the present age. This implies a different order of things from that which existed in the beginning, and a condition of the world belonging to a period far back of the earliest time, ordinarily ascribed to the six days of creation. It hints at revolution and reconstruction, a dying out of old races, and bringing in of new ones to take their place.

Various methods have been suggested for getting rid of these apparent difficulties. To make the records harmonize, we must find authority for lengthening the periods ascribed to Moses, or curtailing those of the Geologists. Like all other important controversies, extreme views have been advocated on both sides. Both extremes lead to infidelity, or encourage it. Evidently, as Hugh Miller has observed, the battle of the evidences will as certainly have to be fought on the field of the Physical Science, as it was contested in the last age on that of the Metaphysics. The friends of the Bible must meet their opponents in the open field and, not despising their adversaries, disarm them in the contest.

Some over-zealous apologists of the Bible, readily solve the difficulty by ignoring its existence. Not understanding enough of science to appreciate the bearing of its facts, they repudiate Geology entirely, deny it even a little niche in the temple of science, and thus rid themselves of the problem of unraveling the Gordian knot, by cutting it with one dire stroke of their magisterial sword. They rule her testimony out of court, and will not admit this stripling science as a witness upon the stand at all. But such disposal of a subject, whose advocates are among the sober-minded and learned men of the age, is an insult to reason and common sense. Denunciation alone will not satisfy thinking minds, much less hush the clamors of scepticism. It did not silence Copernicus or Galileo. The doctrine of the earth's revolution, which seems in greater apparent conflict with revelation than that of its remote antiquity, was denounced by the whole Church, as heresy and the work of the devil. But it triumphed, notwithstanding, and the Church of modern times admits it without apprehending any danger to her impregnable fortress of truth.

On the other hand, some infidel Geologists, pleased with an opportunity to cast reproach upon "Moses and the

prophets," have denied Divine authority to the sacred record. According to these, Moses gathered traditions, or invented fables, and wrote them down to amuse his countrymen or advance his own influence among them. Unfaithful to the best interests of science, they worship the God of Nature alone, and will not allow that He has ever given any other revelation of Himself than that which is found in the material heavens and earth. The only record which they are willing to accept as Divine, is what they find in the solid rock, the uplifted granite, the water-worn pebble, the carefully packed sand-bank, the marvellous coral-reef, the shell-constructed limestone, and the bountiful coral-measures, with their wonderful fossils of extinct plants and animals. This latter heresy is far worse than the former. We deplore both with all the impassioned love we have for truth and humanity. *In medio tutissimus ibis*—in the middle path you will proceed with most safety, or, as the English proverb has it, the truth lies in the golden mean.

Several well-meaning interpreters of the Bible, of very considerable reputation in the theological world, have virtually joined issue with its enemies, by admitting a *purely human element* in the record of Moses, while they hold that the main points only were inspired. (See Knapp's Theology.) It is maintained that Moses gives a poetical or pictorial representation of the work of creation. The outlines of the picture are true, but the filling up is mere fancy and put in for ornament. On the same principle of interpretation, it would be easy to reject the whole Bible, for there is no authorized judge of what is true and what false. A concession like this would send us to sea at once, without chart or compass, the sport of every wind. We cannot consent to trifle thus with the adversary. In Nature God has sketched, not only the bold features of the landscape—its mountains, hills, plains, brooks, rivers and lakes—but also filled up the picture Himself, with an infinite variety of trees, flowers and grasses; so, in Revelation, He has not only traced the leading features of truth, and left erring men to complete the portrait, but has Himself carefully traced all the pencilings and finished the picture. Let there be no doubt on this point. The Bible is God's Book of Revelation, and must coincide, in all its parts, with His Book of Nature. It will not be admissible, therefore, to deny or explain away any part of either record. Both have proceeded from the same Author, and belong, legitimately to the domain of truth. They are written in

characters widely different, by different agents, both difficult of translation into language suited to our comprehension. But certain we are, if rightly understood, they are in perfect harmony; for their Author is a God of order, and not contradiction.

The record of Moses belongs to the department of *pure Revelation*. Its facts lie far back of the most ancient history, and beyond the province of reason. No man could have told him what God did "in the beginning," when "He created the heavens and the earth," or what he did in those days which preceded the introduction of man into the world. Reason cannot lead to the discovery of facts where there is no testimony to examine, whatever may be its power in tracing causes, principles and laws. As the delineator of a Divine panorama, Moses simply described what passed before his vision, perhaps not even understanding the import of his own manuscript. While the writer was fully inspired to record nothing but truth, no inspired interpreter has ever risen to give us, without doubt, his true meaning. His record partakes of the nature of prophecy, with this striking similarity, that the scene of the panorama which he paints, lies beyond the regions of history in the distant past, just as that of the prophet must, necessarily, lie beyond it in the future. All interpreters of prophecy have been at fault. Seldom, if ever, has any prediction been understood, until its fulfilment made it clear. The Jews were sadly mistaken in their notion of the promised Messiah; but now, since we have the historical facts of His advent, life and death, the predictions seem as clear as if written with a sunbeam. Such we believe will be the case with the revealed record of creation, when science, in its noon-tide glory, shall have thrown its light on the picture. Until then we must be satisfied with the few rays we may be able to collect, and not be sceptical because "we see through a glass darkly." The light is there in abundance, clear, beautiful and brilliant. The defect is in the medium through which we mortals look.

Let us now see how it has been proposed to reconcile Science with Revelation, in clearing up the obscurities of this difficult question.

1. The first theory (if it may be dignified with such a title) scarcely allows science a place in the solution. According to the advocates of this theory, the earth is no older, or but little older than chronologists have made it. It is admitted that the earth's crust is composed of many strata, seemingly

the work of protracted ocean currents, that the rocks are replete with fossils, apparently at least, the remains of extinct races of plants and animals—and that there is evidence of extensive changes having taken place since the original creation. But according to some, *Noah's flood accounts for all these.* The flood heaped up mountains of shell-fish, thousands of feet in height, imprisoned the Ammonite in the solid marble, buried the dinotherium, the megatherium, the mastodon and mammoth, deep down in the bowels of the earth, and made, for some of the great saurians and fishes of ante-diluvian times, graves several miles beneath the surface. Without dwelling upon the meagerness of the proof, upon which the flood is supposed to have extended over the whole earth, when man, for whose wickedness it was destroyed, occupied only a portion of its surface, it will be a sufficient refutation of this solution to state, that no competent geologist can find an adequate cause for all the remarkable phenomena brought to light, by a deluge of a few months' continuance and limited, most probably, to a very inconsiderable part of the earth's surface.

Other advocates of the recent origin of the globe, maintain the monstrous absurdity, that *God created the earth originally with all the visible marks of antiquity.* Hence before ever a tree or a flower had sprung from the soil, the traces of primeval forests were discernible—before ever a fish gamboled in the sea, great skeletons of the fish tribe were entombed in the rocks—before ever a frog croaked or a lizard dragged his unwieldy body through the mud, not only were their tracks preserved in the plastic sandstone, but their remains were hermetically sealed, to puzzle and mislead that curious and credulous class of people called Geologists. As a specimen of the argument in favor of this view, the following exquisite extract, from Chateaubriand, will be read with pleasure. The beauty of its conception and style, is a sufficient apology for its length: "We approach," says he, "the last objection concerning the modern origin of the globe. 'The earth,' it is said, 'is an old nurse, whose decrepitude everything announces. Examine its fossils, its marbles, its granites, and you will decipher its innumerable years, by circle, by stratum, or by branch, like those of the serpent by his rattles, or the horse by his teeth, or the stag by his horns.' This difficulty has been a hundred times solved by this answer: 'God *should* have created, and, without question, has created the world with all the marks of antiquity and

completeness, which we now see.' Indeed, it is probable that the Author of nature at first planted old forest and young shoots, that animals were produced, some full of days, others adorned with all the graces of infancy. Oaks, as they pierced the fruitful soil, would bear, at once, the forsaken nest of the crow, and the young posterity of the dove; the caterpillar was chrysalis and butterfly; the insect, fed on the herb, suspended its golden egg amid the forest or trembled in the wavy air; the bee, which had lived a single morning, reckoned its ambrosia by generations of flowers. We must believe that the sheep was not without its young, the fawn without its little ones,—that the thickets hid nightingales, astonished with their own first music, in warming the fleeting hopes of their first loves. * * * The very first day when the ocean dashed its first waves on the shores, it bathed—let us not doubt—rocks already worn by the breakers, beaches strewn with the wrecks of shells, and headlands which sustained against the assaults of the waters, the crumbling shores of earth. Without this inherent old age there would have been neither pomp nor majesty in the work of the Eternal; and, what could not possibly be, nature in its innocence would have been less beautiful than to-day in its corruption. An insipid infancy of plants, animals and elements, would have crowned a world without poetry. But God was not so tasteless a designer of the bowers of Eden as infidels pretend. The man-king was himself born thirty years old, to accord in grandeur with the ancient majesty of his kingdom; and his companion reckoned sixteen springs, which she had not lived, that she might harmonize with birds, flowers, innocence, love and all the youth part of creation." That is to say, God, who would not deign to record even the semblance of falsehood in His word, has made the earth a vast depository of lies. He who would not suffer Moses to utter anything but *literal* truth in unequivocal language, does not scruple to heap up argument upon argument, in the great Museum of Nature, to prove His own work much more ancient than it really is. He would not have us understand a day to mean anything but a day, and yet would have us believe that to have been a fish which was no fish, that floods and tides accumulated layers of sand and mud, where no water ever flowed. In short He would cheat us, by the wrinkles on the brow of time, into the belief that the world is in its decrepitude, when really it is only in the vigor and bloom of youth.

2. The second theory which claims our attention, and which was really the first attempt to reconcile the Two Records, without ignoring either, was suggested by Dr. Chalmers, then a young man, about the beginning of the present century. His words, delivered in a Lecture at St. Andrews, when the science of Geology was yet in its infancy, and quoted by Hugh Miller in his "Testimony of the Rocks," mark an era in the history of this science, in its connection with Revelation: "There is a prejudice," says the Lecturer, "against the speculations of the Geologist, which I am anxious to remove. It has been said that they nurture infidel propensities. It has been alleged that Geology, by referring the origin of the globe to a higher antiquity than is assigned to it by the writings of Moses, undermines our faith in the inspiration of the Bible, and in all the animating prospects of the immortality which it unfolds. This is a false alarm. *The writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe.*" This last sentence contains the germ of all subsequent speculation on the subject. It denies an assumption whose untenableness no previous writer seems to have suspected, viz: that Moses has given even the slightest hint of a date in his monograph of creation. His vision of God's handiwork, in the distant period of which he writes, is as vague in the element of time, as the most undefined prophecy. This entirely changes the *personnel* of the controversy from Moses to his chronologists. No one claims inspiration for these.

According to the theory under consideration, the creation spoken of in the first verse of Genesis, was *a creation out of nothing*, not a reconstructing or re-animating of things which had a previous existence. Here it is intended to be asserted, in opposition to all heathen notions and false teachings of philosophy, that neither the world in its present form, nor the materials of which it is composed, was eternal—that it owed its existence, figure, constitution and condition to no chance, or fortuitous concourse of atoms, but was brought into being and fitted up by the God whom Moses and the children of Israel worshipped. It fixes, unequivocally, upon creation's handiwork the name of its Divine Architect.

The terms "*heaven and earth*" are understood to mean the whole universe—not merely our planet, and its immediate neighbors of the stellar host, but all worlds, suns and systems in the whole realms of space. It is asserted by this phraseology, that there was a time when this vast expanse was sheer emptiness, when the dust, of which worlds are constituted,

had not yet emerged from the abyss of nothingness, when the Deity alone existed, without having called into being anything out of or from beyond Himself. It bounds the sphere of creative energy, and includes within its limits, the *materials* of all that exists.

The term "*beginning*" is the main point in this controversy. The advocates of the theory do not undertake to limit or define its meaning, excepting so far as it is used to designate the time when God inaugurated the work of creation. How far that event dates back in the inconceivably remote past, neither Moses nor the Chronologists inform us. It certainly antedates the period when "the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy;" for there could have been neither morning stars nor sons of God to witness what God did in the *beginning* of creation. No presumptuous chronicler of events, holding the Divinity of Christ, has bridged a passage over the abyss of the unlimited past, or plumed his imagination around the cycles of time, to discover the period when the uncreated Son took joint tenure with the Father upon the throne. Yet is that period just as much defined as the period of creation. "In the *beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Eternity is the measuring line to stretch across this unfathomable void. In matters of pure Revelation, it is impious to be wise above what is written. We might as well attempt to measure the extent of God's universe by roods and miles as its history by days and years. Hence it is maintained, that *the epoch of the world's creation is unrevealed.* The period of its reconstruction may lie within the limits of measured time. An immense interval supervened between the event briefly stated in the first verse of Genesis, and the events detailed in the subsequent verses. The historian of the American Continent informs his readers of the landing of Columbus, the condition of the country at that time, and whatever has been worthy of note since. But what reader is so credulous as to believe that this great continent has no previous history, unwritten though it be? Have the entombed relics of a once powerful nation no meaning? Are we to suppose that cities never existed, whose rubbish bespeaks a perfection of art scarcely rivalled in modern times? that temples, whose walls have defied the ravages of time, never had builders or worshippers? and that mounds, which enclose the relics of countless generations,

were never touched by the hand of man? Shall the antiquarian, pursuing his researches among the memorials of a people that disappeared before the advent of the Spaniard or the Anglo-Saxon, close his eyes in incredulity against Nature's record, preserved in these broken fragments of a nation which produced no historian, or whose record time has failed to preserve? The Geologist is the antiquarian amid the ruins of a primeval world. He accredits Moses fully for all that he has uttered; but he finds a great gap in the manuscript of the man of God; no rupture, however, in the thread of history. Moses, commencing his record with the introduction of the human epoch, wrote in language such as men employ. God had written, in a different language, many volumes of the great history countless ages before. There was a former temple, whose foundations were laid in the beginning, with pillars and colonnades and mountain spires, alcoves and secret repositories, towering in greatness and gorgeously adorned, wanting only the presence of the immortal spirit of man to complete its greatness. This magnificent structure fell beneath the power of the destroyer, chaotic darkness held sway over its ruins until the great Architect evoked order out of confusion, life from death, rebuilt and furnished it for the abode of man.

There was, therefore, a "Pre-Adamite Earth," rank with a luxuriance of vegetation, far surpassing everything of a similar kind since it became the habitation of man. Amid the dank atmosphere of that ancient period, ferns grew to trees, and the grass in the meadows resembled forests. These were the years of great abundance, in which the earth yielded prodigiously, nature gathered her productions, prepared and packed them away carefully, in anticipation of the wants of her yet uncreated lord. Then huge monsters ploughed the briny deep, great creeping things crawled amid the fens and stagnant pools, gigantic beasts walked the earth and fed upon its rank pastures. The ocean rolled where dry land now appears—rocks were forming from sediment on its slimy bottom—fishes, dying and becoming entombed—the dashing waves were washing the beach and rounding the pebbles—rivers and freshets were abrading mountains, and carrying their materials down into the sea—deltas were forming from drift, soon to be clothed with verdure and shaded with forests—islands of coral were slowly rising from the deep green sea, to catch the mote and the insect from the wavy air, and thus prepare a soil and vegetation through the lapse

of ages—icebergs were floating from the poles to the equator with their cargoes of earth, sand and solid rock, to melt and drop their freight beneath a temperate or torrid sun—thousands of agencies were at work preparing the bed of the ocean to take its place as dry land when the epoch of man's creation would draw near. At length a grand catastrophe spread ruin over the earth. Inward throes and trembling, through all her extremities, announced the night of travail. Mountains shot up from the midst of the deep, others sank where they had stood for ages, the affrighted waters broke over their ancient barriers, sweeping into one common grave the living things that dwelt in the sea and those that inhabited the land, which was now every where submerged. Then came chaos and set up her reign of darkness over the whole face of the globe. The dense vapors from the seething waters obscured the heavens and shut out the glory of the sun: "*The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep.*" How long it remained so, neither Moses nor the Geologists have informed us. Some suppose that several such catastrophes occurred before the six days' work of creation commenced. At this point, according to the theory under consideration, "*The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters,*" the denseness of the mist assuaged to let in some rays of light, dark clouds disappeared from the horizon, and the firmament spread its blue concave around the world, the cooling earth sank, leaving mountain wrinkles on her face, with deep gorges between, to receive the now pacified waters—in short, the work of *repair* went on through six successive days, of twenty-four hours each, and closed by ushering in the Divine Sabbath.

This theory clears an open sea for speculation, allows the philosopher and philologist to steer side by side, without dread of collision, and beyond reach of the breakers and batteries of infidelity. It gives to the Geologist all the time his facts demand, and leaves Moses without taint of error. It magnifies our conceptions of the work of the Deity, carrying the imagination back over unmeasured cycles of times, as abroad through boundless space. It finds a world teeming with life, and a universe perfect in harmony, where ignorance dreamed of an inconceivable void and a vacuum which Nature abhors. It has, therefore, met with great favor among the select friends of science and the Bible. At first suggested by Dr. Chalmers in his Lecture at St. Andrews, it was, ten years afterwards, more fully elaborated in his "Re-

view of Cuvier's Theory of the Earth." It has met the approbation and received the support of such princes among Geologists and Theologians, as Doctors Buckland, Conybeare, Pye Smith, John Harris, James Hamilton, Prof. Sedgwick, etc., etc., all of whom coincide in the fundamental maxim of the theory, that *the writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe.*

This scheme, perfectly adequate, in the age in which it was propounded, to harmonize all the facts of Geology then brought to light, with the sacred record, has, nevertheless, failed to satisfy the increasing demands of the science. There is one point in which it is found particularly defective. It holds a state of chaos, preceded by a wiping out of all the old races of animals and followed by a bringing in of the new. Accordingly, none of the extinct species could have been cotemporary with the living. The chain of connection must have been broken, and its several links should be lying far apart. A great gulf must separate between the living creatures of the old order and those of the new. But no such gulf is found. Nature reveals no hiatus in the tide of life. The stream, unchecked, has cast its relics ashore all the way down from the "beginning." The great types of creation have interlaced each other, and now we find the bones of the extinct mammoth side by side in the same rock with those of the living species of the wolf, the goat and the wildcat. What, then, becomes of the doctrine of a chaos, when the world was empty and void? There are no blank pages in Nature's book of history, no empty shelves or alcoves in her grand Museum of antiquities, to account for the supposed dark age, when the world had no living representative to record her history. The Geologists were puzzled; science paused to take breath. At length Dr. Pye Smith, eminent alike in science and theology, suggested a scheme of relief. Continuing to hold, with Chalmers and others, the unrevealed epoch of creation, the supervening period of chaos, and the subsequent six literal days of creation, he modified the former theory, by limiting the chaos to a comparatively small portion of the earth, perhaps a few thousand square miles in Asia, while, in all beyond that, light was unobscured and life prevailed as before. This accounts for the fact, that in Britain and Europe there are no signs of interruption. But it assumes, without having ascertained the fact, that these signs do not exist in Asia. It degrades the grand and comprehensive record of Moses to a monograph upon the his-

tory of a province; it places the darkness upon the face of the deep, which, according to the record, then enveloped the globe, upon a level with an Egyptian night, or the shadow of a volcanic cloud. We confess an inclination to await some grander scheme.

3. In order to solve the difficulties not providied for in the former theories, and harmonize the increasing demands of science with the Bible, it became necessary to interrogate the record again. Mental, like physical light, breaks gradualle upon the benighted world. Aurora first, and then a hopeful twilight, heralds the rising sun. When the finger of God touches the sightless eye, it is opened to behold things—not as they really are—but "men as trees walking;" a second touch enables him that was blind to see "every man clearly." Science, in its glorious march, has "not yet attained," but is "going on unto perfection." If men, in their ignorance, have pledged the Bible to a false philosophy, the world should applaud the effort to repair the mischief. The Salamanca doctors repudiated and stigmatized, as dangerous heresy, the geography of Columbus, which taught that the world was round, and, that proceeding, in a straight line, would bring the voyager back to the place from which he started. Francis Turretin, and the old Franciscans, made a similar ado about the astronomy of Copernicus and Galileo. In compassion for the ignorance of men, God suffered the sun of science to stand still for awhile, but it has gone forward ever since. The day advances, though the slumbering multitudes open not their eyes to behold the rejoicing of her glorious king.

> "Truth, crushed to earth, will rise again—
> The eternal years of God are hers."

Anxious to retain the theory of six literal days of Divine labor, some have suggested the idea of immense intervals between the successive acts of creation, as a probable solution of the difficulty. Nature has been subject to a series of spasms, awaking each time with new signs of life after a long period of death. But evidently the dying out of old races, and bringing in of new, was gradual, not sudden or spasmodic. The evidence is in favor, not of isolated acts of creation taking place suddenly, after long intervals of rest, but of continuous creations, running through the whole period.

The theory, advocated by Hugh Miller, Professors Silliman, Dana, Guyot, and others among Geologist, and support-

ed by Taylor Lewis and other philologists, is thought to furnish the best solution. The first verse in Genesis is taken as an epitome of the whole chapter. The writer commences his narrative by stating a general fact, and then proceeds to unfold the particulars of his statement. Each "day" signalizes separate acts, on the part of the Creator, which took place—not in the limited period of twenty-four hours—but in a vast and indefinite cycle of time. There were, therefore, instead of six natural days, *six great epochs of creation*, allowing, in each, sufficient time for all the changes traced by the Geologist. In the *first period* God produced light, and caused it to expel the darkness. The world was lighted up, but from what source the light emanated we are not told. The sun was not assigned his office in the heavens until the fourth day. In the *second period* the waters were collected from the surrounding atmosphere, and the firmament established. The vapors, next the earth were condensed and dropped down, or were driven into the upper regions, to float as clouds, representing "the waters above the firmament," and still shutting out the face of the sun. In the *third period* the waters were gathered into the ocean, dry land appeared, and the vegetable kingdom was inaugurated. The *fourth period* was distinguished by the appearance of the sun and moon in the heavens, to rule the day and the night, times and seasons. The work of the former three periods was wrought amid darkness or twilight breaking through the murky clouds. Now the full-orbed sun rides forth, spreading his glories in the heavens, to meet the astonished gaze of the animated creation about to advance upon the stage. In the *fifth period*, the animal kingdom was first established, but only in its oviparous types—the sea teemed with fishes, the pools and marshes with creeping things, and the air with birds. In the *sixth period* came land animals—the beasts of the field and the forest—and at the close of it, man, to crown the whole and be its lord. Then God ceased from his labor and rested.

To see how far this theory settles the difficulty, we must first examine the Record, and then the facts of Science.

We have said concerning Moses, that he neither gathered traditions nor wrote a fable. His record is neither myth nor poetry, but *pure Revelation*, free from all taint of human error. Inspiration may either be verbal or by vision. In the one case the writer is the amanuensis of God, merely setting on paper what the Spirit indites; in the other, he paints in

symbolic characters the Divine panorama which passes before his mind. The Spirit employed Isaiah and Ezekiel to write *words* of prophecy, but John He wrapped in *vision*, on the isle of Patmos, and opened before him a scroll of symbolic beasts, to foreshadow the grand events of coming time. We are inclined to believe, with Prof. Kurtz, in his "Bible and Astronomy," that the account of creation belongs to the department of *vision*. We would place it in the same category with the burning bush, the valley of dry bones, the beasts of Daniel and vials of John. While the Ark is floating over the sea of time, we find the author of the Apocalypse at its head, with prophetic telescope, taking a long look into the future, and the author of Genesis, at the stern, making a similar explanation of the past. If one descries only mountain peaks as they arise, the other discovers only bold features of the landscape fading in the distance. Like principles of interpretations must be applied to both. History will explain the mysteries of John—science will unlock the secrets of Moses. Until history is complete, the Apocalypse will lack an interpreter fully competent; until science is perfect, the account of creation will be shadowed with doubt.

The language of Moses cannot be history, at least not human history, either in its authorship or the subject of which it treats. Human history is bounded on the one side by the unexplored future; on the other, by the unrecorded past. Both extremes lie equally beyond the province of historic research. We look upon Moses as a seer, elevated above the sphere of human observation, and looking back as an *eye-witness* upon the grand scene displayed in the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth. There rises before his vision first a scene of chaos, matter in its elementary (gaseous) condition—"without form and void"—the elements in a violent state of activity, when "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Dense columns of steam rise from the boiling surges of an ocean lying everywhere upon a bed glowing with intense heat—black clouds settle around the earth—"darkness was upon the face of the deep." This was the evening of the first day, a symbolic night stretching over the great chasm that intervened between the original creation of matter, in its elementary form, and that condition of the earth, gradually cooled, which would admit of a partial condensation of its superfluous vapors. Now the scene changes; the clouds become so attenuated that the light begins to break through. The world has the

appearance of a misty morning, objects visible, but dimly defined. The seer takes his pencil and with a few bold dashes, paints the first act in the drama—the darkness and the light, "the evening and the morning" of the first symbolic day. Who can imagine this to have been an ordinary day? It is not defined by the limits of such a day. God did not work by man's time-piece. There was no rising and setting of a sun, which did not show his face until the fourth day. He called the *light* day, and the *darkness* He called night; but the alternation was occasioned neither by the appearing of the sun, in the one case, nor the hiding of it in the other. The curtain rises again, and the seer beholds the buoyant atmosphere, relieved of its dense vapors, bearing the clouds aloft, and spreading the firmament beneath them. The period has its beginning and end—evening and morning—but as yet no visible rising and setting sun. Man's time-piece was still shut up in a dark case. The second symbolic day is closed. The seer is awaked again to behold mountains emerge from the deep. The sea is tempested by the upheaving hills—the prophet's ears are stunned by the affrighted waters—the Alps and the Appenines are born—the Eastern and the Western Continents leap up before the eyes of the astonished beholders. Did God work by man's time-piece on the third day? Could the wave, that started from Central Asia in the morning, reach the Indian Ocean by midnight? Is it likely that the bed of the ocean was prepared for a crop planted in twenty-four hours? In this act the seer beholds not only the waters gathered together, and the dry land appearing, but the earth clothed with grass, decked with flowers, and waving with forests. The herb was not only sowed but yielding seed; the fruit tree, not merely planted, but bearing fruit. Does this act of the prophetic drama look as if it had occupied only the space between the rising and setting sun?

It is not necessary to follow the record through all its periods. Enough has been said to indicate the manner, in which we conceive the revelation to have been made. It was not a mere dictation of words, but a Divine *vision*, appearing in six consecutive acts, which the writer has represented as transpiring within as many symbolic days. The record is singularly beautiful, harmonious and complete. No human mind could have devised its order and consistency as a whole. It is composed of two parts, the one pertaining to the inorganic and the other to the organic world—each comprising three

days, severally a preparation for the succeeding day. Each part begins with light, and ends with a day of two acts, the latter being symbolic of what is to succeed. The close of the last inorganic day or period, was signalized by the introduction of the organic, which was to be characteristic of the remaining periods; while the last of the organic was signalized by the introduction of man, with his immortal spirit, symbolizing the advent of the spiritual epoch, which closes the drama and ushers in the Divine Sabbath, which the world is now enjoying.

Our chief difficulty is in the use of the word *day* in the sense of an extended period. And yet it is plain that the Record itself employs the term with at least three different significations. In the fifth verse it is said, "God called the *light* day," and in the same verse the *evening and the morning*—or, as the literalist will contend, the space of twenty-four hours—were called day. In the fourth verse of the second chapter, the term *day* is applied to the whole epoch of creation, from its beginning to its close. It is clear, as has already been intimated, that the first three days could not have been marked by a rising and setting sun, which began to "divide the day from the night" only on the fourth day. A similar indefinite use of the term is common in Scripture. "Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven." Abraham saw Christ's day and rejoiced in it, that is, the period of His manifestation in the flesh. "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." As Moses was a seer in the same sense in which Daniel and John were, looking into the past through the same Divine medium that enabled them to look into the future, why not interpret his days on the symbolic principle as well as theirs? The "seventy weeks" were not literal weeks, nor were the "time, times and an half," the "thousand two hundred and ninety days," and the "thousand three hundred and five and thirty days," literal days. History has furnished the key to these. John's "thousand years," during which Satan is to be bound, is yet a matter of mystery. Perhaps by the time the historian shall have cleared up this mystery, the man of science will have arranged his cycles and diagrams so as to give a satisfactory explanation of Moses.

But we are told that we must have six literal days, in order to get a consistent foundation for the institution of the

Sabbath. That we must have six days is readily admitted, but that they must be measured by man's sun dial is no more necessary than that God's work should have been precisely the same as man's. If we find evidence that God labored six great symbolic days, and rested the seventh, we greatly extend the foundation for the Sabbath, without in the least altering its proportions. In passing from the human to the Divine day, we rise, in our comprehension of the element of time, to a breadth of prospect altogether befitting the subject. But if the literalist will insist upon the ordinary limit for each of the six days of Divine labor, what bounds will he affix to the Divine Sabbath? It has a beginning, had it also a close? God finished His work on the sixth day, and rested on the seventh; did He resume His labors the following week, or does His Sabbath still continue? When Jesus was accused of violating the human Sabbath, he said: "*My Father worketh hitherto* (on *His* Sabbath) *and I work.*" The Divine Architect, having passed through the six great epochs of the physical creation, introduced the spiritual era by breathing into man the breath of life and making him a living soul. Then His sphere of action was transferred from the kingdom of Nature to the kingdom of Grace. Here the work, peculiar to Him on the Divine Sabbath, is beautifully in harmony with those acts of love and mercy which are lawful on the Christian's Sabbath. And this extended epoch of Divine rest, viewed as the ante-type of man's brief rest day, is strikingly in harmony with all the other types and and ante-types of the Bible. The ante-type is always greater than the type—the Divine, always more comprehensive than the human. The Church, with the flaming presence of the Eternal Spirit, is far greater than its representative which Moses saw in the burning bush, and "the Lamb of Gob, which taketh away the sins of the world," is infinitely superior to the Paschal Lamb, recalling scenes of deliverance from Egyptian bondage. So the Divine Sabbath, being ante-type of the human, is infinitely extended. Commencing with the last act of creation, it has been prolonged until the present, and from now, which may yet be Sabbath morning with Him, it will continue until the final destruction of the present economy.

How do the facts of Geology harmonize with the theory of extended epochs of creation? An extract from that prince of Geologists, who "quarried truth, rough hewn from the solid rock, and chiselled it into a perfect gem"—the admira-

ble and eloquent Hugh Miller—will enable the reader to understand the order in which the strata occur. He has made the observation, that three of the days—the first, second and fourth—cannot, from the nature of the work done in them, be expected to have left many traces in the crust of the globe. Then he proceeds to say: "What may be termed the three *Geologic* days, the third, fifth and sixth, may be held to have extended over those carboniferous periods, during which the great plants were created, over those Oolitic and Cretaceous periods, during which the great sea monsters and birds were created, and over those Tertiary periods, during which the great terrestial mammals were created. For the intervening or fourth day, we have that wide space, represented by the Permian and Triassic periods, which, less conspicuous for their floras than the period that went immediately before, and less conspicuous in their faunas than the periods that came immediately after, were marked by the decline and ultimate extinction of the Palæozoic forms, and the first partially developed beginnings of the Secondary ones. And for the first and second days, there remain the great Azoic period, during which the immensely developed gneisses, mica schists, and primary clay states, were deposited, and the two extended periods represented by the Silurian and Old Red Sandstone systems. These, taken together, exhaust the Geologic scale, and may be named in their order as, *first*, the Azoic day or period; *second*, the Silurian, or Old Red Sandstone, day or period; *third*, the Carboniferous day or period; *fourth*, the Permian and Triassic day or period; *fifth*, the Oolitic and Cretaceous day or period; *sixth*, the Tertiary day or period."

We find, therefore, underlying all the other rocks, those which contain no organic remains whatever. They bear unmistakeable evidence of having been first subjected to great heat, and then to the action of water, disintegrating, pulverising and afterwards reconstructing their materials. This condition of the earth corresponds to those periods of creation, during which the ocean had full sway. They constitute the inorganic epochs of Moses. The two great agencies—fire and water—were actively employed preparing the crust of the globe to become a supporter of life. But nothing possessing life had yet appeared. Overlying these—the Azoic rocks—are found the Palæozoic rocks, containing the earliest forms of life. The vegetable kingdom has deposited its relic all through them. A gigantic flora is conspicuous

everywhere. This was emphatically the age of great plants, following in harmony with Moses, the subsidence of the ocean and appearing of dry land. Then, in full harmony with the Record, appear, in order, the fishes, reptiles and birds; all the oviparous or egg-producing animals; next the mammals, beasts of the field and forest; and last of all, man. The order of succession is the same in both Records.

This last theory seems to furnish the most satisfactory solution of the difficulties. It has, however, its weak points. We do not stake our faith in the Bible upon the success of any of these attempts to harmonize its contents with science. The question of its Divine inspiration is settled most satisfactorily on other grounds, and we mean to stand by it. What we have written is designed to show how it has been proposed to adjust the apparent collision between revealed and scientific truth. The materials have been gathered mainly from the authors whose names are mentioned. We only maintain, in this stage of the world's progress in knowledge, the possibility of reconciling, beyond all doubt, the Two Records. The student of the Bible may have put a wrong interpretation on Moses; the Geologist may have drawn unwarranted inferences from his facts; but the Bible, with its written Revelation from the Spirit of God, and the world, with its monuments of past ages, sculptured in the rocks by the hand of God, are both from the same Author and must harmonize. The present generation may not see the full splendor of the blended light from these wonderful Books, but the human mind, in its triumphant march, is approaching the noon-day of science, when all obscurity must vanish and all doubts be solved.

We may be allowed a few reflections before closing. "Could we rightly interrogate," says Sir David Brewster, "the rounded pebbles at our feet, it would read us an exciting chapter on the history of primeval times, and would tell us of convulsions by which it was wrenched from its parent rock, and of the floods by which it was abraded and transported to its present humble locality." The boulder, disturbed by the ploughman's share, in its bed of clay or sand, has been a great traveller since it left its ancient mountain. It might tell of earthquakes, by which it was heaved to the surface; of ice-bergs, by which it was borne over tempestuous seas; of great monsters of the deep, encountered in its voyage; of terrific commotions when its ocean-bed became dry land. The sand beneath our feet has passed through

turbulent seas, and been disturbed by many a flood. The stones that pave our streets or adorn our houses, preserve the record of ages immediately anterior to the history of Moses or the invention of letters. The coal that heats our apartments, and furnishes its imprisoned gases to illumine the printed page as we read of the wonders of God, was prepared and packed away for the use of man ages before he stood erect to assume the lordship of creation. The spotless Parian marble, that is chiseled into the lineaments of "the human face Divine" to give expression to the God-like intellect of creation's lord, was formed at the bottom of the deep green sea. The emerald, the ruby and the sapphire, that lend their charm to beauty, were silently and curiously wrought in nature's laboratory, in the lowest strata of the earth's crust, whence they were sent up through dikes and veins to be gathered and polished by the lapidary. *O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made all; the earth is full of thy riches!*

In all the works of God, we see the most wonderful productions of the most silent and unobtrusive agents. Say not that the tiny insect or worm is an insignificant creature. These are nature's most efficient workers. Man is a drone compared with creatures whose minuteness compels him to use a microscope to discover their existence. These little creatures have constructed mountains, which his proudest achievements have barely bored through, and whose heights he timidly ventures to scan. The coral polyp, so near a plant that we almost hesitate to call it animal, rears, from the ocean's depths, islands suited to be the habitation of man. Crustacea, so minute, that forty thousand millions of them may occupy a cubic inch of space, have formed layers and beds miles in extent and many feet in thickness. These hidden things brought to light by the Geologist, and revealing the foot-prints of Him whose way is in the deep, are, in a literal sense, the secrets of the Almighty. How emphatically may He be styled the Fountain of wisdom, the evidences of whose handiwork are traced in every object that meets the eye! Silently as His footsteps fall and buried beneath "the great sea deep," yet, when the cycles of time roll on and the dry land appears, there are the records of countless ages, legibly written and hermetically sealed in the solid rock. The true priests of nature alone are admitted into this inner temple, to interrogate the Author of Nature concerning the secrets entrusted to her keeping, and the laws

impressed upon her, when He made the heavens and the earth in the beginning.

It is an innocent mistake to suppose that fire and water, which, in their combination, have recently come into the service of man, to record, by means of the Divine act of printing, the glowing thoughts of the human mind, have achieved their greatest wonders in modern times. The same elements have been employed in tracing the foot-prints of the Creator since time began. The river, the ocean, the tornado, the snow-drift, the glacier, the iceberg, the subtle vapor, more potent than the steam-press; all these have been employed to print in Nature's book a language, whose alphabet has been recently deciphered, and whose profound meaning is now read with admiration and wonder, by the student of Nature. The pent-up fires, in the interior of the earth, have sent to its surface, through seams and crevices and volcanic craters, messages and volumes of deep meaning, from the very heart of the mother whose bounty supports life, and in whose bosom all find sweet repose.

Once more. We find that death has been the universal law with all organic beings since the remotest time. Truthfully and beautifully has the poet said:

> "All that tread
> The globe, are but a handful to the tribes
> That slumber in its bosom. Take the wings
> Of the morning, and the Barcan desert pierce,
> Or loose thyself in the continuous woods,
> Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
> Save its own dashings—yet the *dead* are there;
> And millions in those solitudes, since first
> The flight of years began, have laid them down
> In their last sleep: the dead reign there alone."

And far back of the age of man, in creation's dawn, ere the poet began to dream of the sad necessity of "shuffling off this mortal coil," death was doing his work, filling his catacombs in the rock-ribbed mountain, strewing the relics of his sad work in the caverns of the sea, and sweeping from earth, air and ocean whole tribes, orders and races of living creatures. What a vast Pompeii is the world with its entombed relics of distant ages and extinct races! What a sad wail is that drifted to our ears over the surges of the dark ocean of the remote past!

# ARTICLE III.

## THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.

By Rev. M. Loy, A. M., Delaware, O.

The question of the Church and her ministry, which has already been debated so long and so warmly, is attracting constantly increasing attention in the Lutheran Church. Many who were hitherto silent, and seemingly unconcerned spectators of the controversy, are beginning to acknowledge the great practical import of its issues and to take sides in the contest. While some view the whole question as an open one, upon which our Confessions give no decision and our Church has no faith, but concerning which she is yet in search of the truth, others find it settled within her borders centuries ago, and insist that the whole controversy turns upon the adoption or rejection of the Lutheran faith, as plainly and pointedly expressed in the symbols. But among those who occupy the latter position, there are again differences by no means unimportant. The conflict is perhaps most ardent among those who profess full adherence to our confession, but who differ as to their meaning in reference to this subject. Under such circumstances, those who love Zion, and pray for her peace and prosperity, will not be deemed officious for desiring to contribute something towards the elucidation of the question, though it be but a mite that they have to offer. Such a contribution the following essay is designed to present on the Gospel ministry. Our only aim is the truth; we wish to wrong no man, or body of men, by dealing harshly with persons or unfairly with statements; but we find neither indecision nor inconsistency in our symbols, and can see no reason for doubt or difference among those who adopt them as the expression of their own faith, on this subject as well as others. We, therefore, trust it will not be deemed intolerant or unkind, to speak positive when our convictions are positive.

§ 1. *The salvation of souls is ordinarily dependent upon the Divinely appointed means of grace, which require administration.*

All men are children of wrath by nature, and dead in trespasses and sins. But God, who is rich in mercy, pitied

His fallen creatures, and, in His infinite love, determined to save them. To this end He sent His only Son into the world to bear our sin and suffer its dreadful penalty. "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of Sons." Gal. 4 : 4, 5. By the active and passive obedience of Jesus, this redemption was accomplished: it is finished. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Gal. 3 : 13. No one is excluded from its benefits: it embraces the whole human race. "God our Saviour will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. 1 Tim. 2 : 4–6.

But the salvation, which has been acquired for all, must be brought to men before they can have it in their possession. The merits of Christ are of no avail where they are not appropriated, and where they are not offered there can be no appropriation. Jesus died for the damned as well as for the saved; the mere fact of His death, apart from the application of its saving power, does not restore the fallen. We remain dead in trespasses and sins until the Holy Spirit quicken us. Luther, commenting on John 3 : 14, illustrates this, with his usual clearness, by referring to the serpent which Moses lifted up in the wilderness, and the necessity of looking upon it to live, remarking that "it would avail us nothing if Christ had died a thousand times upon the cross, if the word 'whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish' were not given, just as it would have availed the children of Israel nothing if they had, of their own accord, lifted up a thousand serpents." Salvation is by faith; but "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" Rom. 10 : 14.

To convey the purchased salvation to men, God has, therefore, appointed certain means, by which it is uniformly offered for man's appropriation by faith. Chief of these is His blessed Word. "I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary, is my Lord, who hath redeemed, purchased and delivered me, a poor, forlorn, condemned person, from sin, from death, and from the power of the devil." But "I also believe that I cannot, by my own reason, or

other natural power, believe in or come to Jesus Christ my Lord, but that the Holy Spirit hath called me, by the Gospel." And this faith is founded upon plain and direct words of the Holy Ghost. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1 : 16. Or, as the same Apostle expresses it again in another place: "So, then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10 : 17. There is no salvation without faith, and no faith without the Divine word. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3 : 26. But the Lord commanded His word to be proclaimed, that sinful men, receiving it in faith, might become children and heirs. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." John 17 : 20. Therefore St. James says: "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures." 1 : 18. And as this word, which is quick and powerful, appoints the two sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Supper, and is connected with them in the form of a promise which cannot be broken, the same efficacy is ascribed to them as the word itself. They are means for the bestowal of grace unto salvation. For "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." John 3 : 5. And St. Paul testifies that "after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. 3 : 5. In complete harmony with this, is the declaration of St. Peter, that "Baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 3 : 21. Indeed wherever the efficacy of this sacrament is spoken of in the Scriptures, it is declared to be a means of salvation. So the Holy Communion is instituted for the imparting of Christ's body and blood which is given and shed for the remission of sins, Matt. 26 : 26–8, and those who believe cannot fail to enjoy the blessing, which it is designed to bestow, and which the word promises. Where these means are used the Kingdom of God is established and souls enter into it; where they do not exist, there can, as far as God has been pleased to reveal to us, be no salvation. Therefore God sent forth minis-

ters to bear the glad tidings of the redemption to all nations, and promised that he that believeth the word shall be saved; and, therefore, our confession declares "that for the purpose of obtaining this faith, God has instituted the ministry, giving the Gospel and the Sacraments, through which, as means, He imparts the Holy Spirit, who, in His own time and place, works faith in those that hear the Gospel;" Augsb. Conf. Art. 5; and again, Art. 28: "This power is to be exercised only by teaching or preaching the word, and by administering the sacraments, either to many or few, as the case may be; for here are granted, not corporeal, but eternal things, as eternal righteousness, the Holy Ghost, everlasting life. These things cannot come but by the ministration of the word and sacraments."

These means of God's appointment always contain and offer the salvation which Christ has purchased for all men, and offer it alike to all who hear. They are channels of grace whether men believe or disbelieve. God's offer of gracious treasures is entirely independent of man's reception or rejection: it is made that men may receive; if it is rejected, no less a treasure than everlasting life is rejected. If the means contained nothing it would be a gross abuse of language, and an impious trifling with sacred things, to speak of embracing or refusing the gracious offer. "What if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid! yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." Rom. 3 : 3, 4. "We must teach that when God searches or commands anything, or baptizes, it is the truth, whether the recipient be a worthy or unworthy person. When the sun shines, it is and remains the sun, whether one dies or sleeps, whether he sees it or not. . . . Baptism and the Gospel are right, and remain unchanged even if I do not believe." Luther 44 : 164, (Ed. Erl.) Not as though the means of grace necessarily made heirs of heaven of all to whom they are brought. Far from it: only he that believeth shall be saved. "Unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them; but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." Heb. 4 : 2. And, as the word never saves without faith, neither can the sacraments, which derive their whole efficacy from the word. Therefore our Church declares, in reference to the great benefit of the sacraments: "It is not the water which produces them, but the word of God which is connected with the water, and our faith confiding in the word of

God in the use of baptismal water," and: "it is not the eating and drinking which produces them, but that solemn declaration, which is given and shed for you for the remission of sins; which words, besides the literal eating and drinking, are the chief thing in the sacrament; wherefore, whoever truly believes these words, has what they promise, even the forgiveness of sins." Sm. Cat., iv, v. But to infer from this that the Divine means contain saving power only in some select cases, or that the grace is imparted through some other channel, would be simply absurd. "Although not all believe, yet there are many who do. Christ does not say that all will believe; but it does not follow from this that nobody will. What manner of inference is this which they make, when they conclude that because not all believe, therefore faith does not come by the word? Then I could also juggle, and conclude that because all do not obey the civil government nor their parents, therefore there is no need for Governments or parents, and God's command is null. Hence we reverse it and say thus: We know and can prove, by many passages and examples of Scripture, that some who hear the word believe it, and, therefore, conclude that the word is necessary and profitable, not for the ears alone, but also for the heart and the inward man. That some do not believe, though they hear the word, does not detract anything from it; it remains true, notwithstanding, that it is the means by which faith is wrought in the heart, and that no one can obtain faith without it." Luther 50 : 251.

These means of grace, in the very nature of the case, require administrators. "How shall they call upon Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" Rom. 10 : 14. God has indeed given us the Scriptures in a written form, and commanded us all to search them, that our faith may stand upon the word of God alone; and the Scriptures are so perspicuous that an honest heart can find the truth unto salvation, in case of necessity, without a teacher. But ordinarily "faith comes by hearing" still, and those who have no teachers manifestly labor under great disadvantages. This is plain from the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, recorded in Acts 8 : 30, 31: "Philip ran thither to him and heard him read the Prophet Esaias, and said: Understandest thou what thou readest? and he said, How can I, except some man should guide me." Our natural disinclination to give attention to Divine things, and our

proneness to forget them and slight them, render the aids afforded by competent and faithful teathers requisite. Luther, whose profound reverence and ardent love for the written word will not be questioned, therefore says: "There are now many who declare: O, I have already learned the Gospel quite well, there is no danger about me. Some even come out boldly and say: What further need have we of a pastor or preacher? Can we not read for ourselves at home? Then they go on in their security and do not read it at home either; or, if they even do read it at home, it is not so productive and powerful as it is in the public sermon from the lips of the preacher, whom God hath called and appointed to proclaim it to thee." 4 : 401. God's method of bringing the truth to men has ever been chiefly, and must ever so remain, that of preaching the word, that man may hear it and believe. And that the holy sacraments must be administered is self-evident. The mandate still remains in force, that messengers should go into into all the world to preach the Gospel, to baptize in the name of the Holy Trinity, and to administer the holy sacrament of the altar, that souls may thus be saved through the blood of Jesus. This is the work of the Gospel ministry.

§ 2. *The administration of these means belongs originally to all believers, or to the whole Christian Church.*

Before Christian congregations were formed, through the word which our Saviour proclaimed, every believer had the right, and must have felt it to be a duty, to spread the glad tidings as much as lay in his power. For faith ever seeks utterance for the glory of God, and love ever prompts to share with others our joys and hopes. We accordingly read that the first believers, whose faith came by hearing the preaching of Jesus, spake the truth to others whom they found, and urged them to come to Jesus. Every reader of the Gospel is aware of this; we need but instance Andrew's finding Simon and telling him about the Messiah's advent, and Philip's finding Nathaniel and urging him to come and see the promised Christ. John 1. That this proclamation of the truth, was made, in the first place, by persons who were subsequently called to be apostles, is true; but no one will be likely to presume that they first told their friends and neighbors about Jesus in any official capacity: they did so simply as believers, and were the first to do so because they were the first believers. The duty of confessing Christ could

not be performed otherwise: its very object is the glory of God by the promulgation of saving truth. Thus the consoling truth of the Saviour's resurrection was first proclaimed, not by persons holding an office in the Church, but by believing women, to whom it had been made known by angels at the sepulchre. "It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles." Luke 24 : 10. The truth thus declared was, and is, the power of God unto salvation, just as fully as when it is publicly preached in the congregation by men holding an ecclesiastical office. "The sacraments and the word are efficacious," says the Augsburg Confession, Art. 8, "on account of the appointment and command of Christ," not at all on account of the character or office of the persons by whom they are administered. Although God has established a particular order, according to which the means of grace are dispensed publicly in the Church, the violation of which Divine order, is, of course, sinful, yet it is plain that the means themselves are the property of every believer, to be used in subjection to God's will, which is the salvation of souls by them.

All this seems very evident; to prove it would seem, at first sight, almost a work of supererogation. But these high prerogatives of Christians, are often denied in this controversy, sometimes implicitly, sometimes even explicitly. Men will not cease dreaming of a state, in the Kingdom of God, which is higher than that of faith, and sonship with God, through faith—a state with higher rights and nobler titles than those of the believer, to which alone the means of grace and the prerogative of saving souls belong. Against this we would array the evidences of Scripture, in defence of what we conceive to be the Christian's inalienable rights. We would not, in any way, or in any sense, disparage the holy office which we feel it a privilege to hold. "I magnify mine office;" for it is degraded by arrogating rights, which God has not conferred, and magnified by holding and executing it as God was pleased to give it. The highest dignity is that of the Christian; the most glorious rights and privileges are those of the believer. Our chief joy and glory is not that we hold an honorable office in the Church on earth, but that we are sons of God and heirs of heaven, through God's abounding grace in Christ. The office would be shorn of all its highest beams of glory, if this, its heavenly light, were abandoned. We are jealous for the rights of our office;

we are more jealous still for the far more glorious rights of our state as believers in Jesus. The saving of souls is the work of the Church, of the believers in Jesus Christ the Saviour, not of an exclusive class in the Church; the means of grace belong primarily to the Church, to believers, not exclusively to a class among them: to establish this from the word of God, and show that our Church has been faithful to the word, in her doctrine upon the subject, in opposition to the proud pretensions of Romanism and Romanizing hierarchism, is the object of this section.

I. According to the Word of God, all believers are priests and called to perform priestly functions: the priesthood in the Church, is not a select class within her pale, but all true Christians, and whatever rights and powers belong to the Christian priesthood, belong equally to all believers. In order to present the matter as clearly as we can, we shall inquire.

1. *What is a priest?* He is person who, according to the Divine will, sustains a two-fold relation in the sphere of religion, acting towards God in the name of man, and towards man in the name of God. He represents man before his Maker, bringing sacrifices to Him on behalf of His fallen creature. "Let the priests also which come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves." Ex. 19 : 22. They are permitted to enter into the presence of the Holy One, to lay their offerings at His feet. "Even him whom He hath chosen will He cause to come near unto Him." This privilege and duty of priests to approach the Lord, and present sacrifices, is universally acknowledged. But it by no means embraces the whole of the sacerdotal office. The priest is appointed to represent God before men just as clearly. He is a teacher of truth; a bearer of messages from God to man. "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." Mal. 2 : 7. He is the ordinary teacher under the old dispensation; the prophetic was an extraordinary office to supply the deficiencies of an unfaithful priesthood. "Ordinarily the ecclesiastical ministry, from Moses until the time of Christ, was committed to the Levitical priests, but because they were sometimes negligent in the preservation and propagation of the purity of the heavenly doctrine, nay, even contaminated it with Baalitic and other idolatrous worship, God extraordinarily called prophets, by whose ministry the corruptions should be removed, the promises concerning the

Messiah repeated and illustrated, and men invited to repentance by the menace of special punishments." Gerhard Loc. 24, § 212. The Lord's command to Aaron and his sons, was that they should "teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses." Lev. 10 : 11. "What is a priest then? One in whose mouth God has put His word, as Malachi says: 'The priest's lips should keep knowledge,' and who makes sacrifices and prays for others. Such a priest in faith may come before God, pray for the people, speak their word, and intercede with God for them; then come forth again to the people and present to them God's answer and command." Luther 36 : 14. And,

2. *Such a priest is every believer.* It is an important fact, which cannot be gainsaid, that incumbents of the ministerial office, are never, in the New Testament, called priests. They are designated by various names, but never once by this. And it is equally certain that believers are so denominated, and only they. In all the passages of the New Testament, in which priests are spoken of under the new dispensation, the reference is to believers only. To be certified of this the reader need but refer to the passages, which are not numerous. Of the five to be found, there are two in 1 Pet. 2, and three in the book of Revelation. When it is said, in the first two passages, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ," and "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light," no one, who pays the least attention to the words and their context, will presume that the address is not to all the members of the Lord's body. They who form the spiritual house form the holy and royal priesthood also. The persons addressed are not bishops and deacons, but "strangers scattered" through various countries, who are "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus," "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." The children of God by faith, are priests, whether they hold an office or not. The same is manifest from the passages in Revelation. They of whom it is said, Christ "hath made us kings and priests unto God," are the same of whom it is

asserted: "He loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood;" when the Lamb is addressed, further, in the words: "Thou wast slain and hath redeemed us to God by Thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto God kings and priests," it would be the most arbitrary procedure to apply the predicate "priests" to any other subjects than those, to whom the predicate "redeemed" belongs, since, in the words of Scripture, the subjects are in both cases the same: and when, in the last passage, it is declared that "they shall be priests of God and of Christ," there is surely not much difficulty in finding to whom this refers, namely, to them who have "part in the first resurrection," and on whom "the second death hath no power." It is incontrovertibly certain from this, that there is, under the new dispensation, no combination of the Levitical priesthood, confined to a certain class within the holy nation, but that now the whole nation is a nation of priests. So far as the Old Testament priesthood is a type of anything in the New, it has for its ante-type not the ministerial office, but the congregation of believers. We are all "made nigh by the blood of Christ," and can appear before God without the mediation of any other priest than Christ, having "access by one Spirit unto the Father," that we may offer acceptable sacrifices by Christ Jesus, and show forth His praises in word and work.

That as such priests, believers have the right to teach as well as pray, is involved in the very nature of the priesthood as the Bible describes it. We have seen that the priests were the appointed teachers of the people, as well as their representatives in the offering of sacrifices. Before persons presume to deny the New Testament priests any of those rights, which God has manifestly conferred upon the priesthood from its first institution, they should look well to their warrant for it, remembering the dreadful consequences of an interference with God's prerogatives. That the priesthood now is not the same as it was from the beginning, we not only admit but earnestly maintain, because the word of God authorizes and requires us to do so. But that the change lies in the cessation of its most important functions, which are as needful now as ever, we could believe only upon the authority of God. Where is the Scripture proof for such an assumption? What is there in the Divine economy as revealed in the New Testament, that renders it necessary? Whatever changes there may be in the qualifications requisite for

the priesthood, and in the character of its teachings and sacrifices, the priesthood itself with its rights and duties of teaching and offering sacrifice remains.

And not only is there no evidence that the priesthood, under the new dispensation, has been deprived of one of its most important privileges, which fact alone would be sufficient to render their maintenance and exercise obligatory upon us, but there are at least indications, if not positive proofs, sufficiently cogent in themselves, to the contrary. Believers are a "royal priesthood" that they may "show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light." We trust no considerate person would maintain that this is fully accomplished by offering to God the spiritual sacrifices of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving. For the purpose is not so much, according to the language of the Scriptures, to offer praises to God, as it is to proclaim His excellencies to men, that His praise may be made glorious in the earth—to show forth His perfections for the hallowing of His name. And to know how this is done requires no very extensive erudition or profound thought. Children are taught it in the Catechism. God's praises are shown forth, His name hallowed, "when the word of God is taught pure and unadulterated, and we, as the children of God, lead holy lives conformably to its precepts." Never can the design of the priesthood, to show forth God's praises, be accomplished without using His word, in which His perfections are displayed. He is glorified by the truth, because this shows Him to be worthy of all praise, and teaches and enables men to give it.

So the Church has always taught. Our symbols not only leave room for the presumption that the priesthood of believers authorizes these to be active in the salvation of souls, by the use of God's means, but they positively affirm that it involves such authority. "Besides this one propitiatory sacrifice," says the Apology, 253 : 25, (Müll. Ed.) "there are others, also, which are thank-offerings, as the preaching of the Gospel, affliction, and the good works of saints. . . . These are sacrifices of the New Testament, as St. Peter says 1 Pet. 2 : 5." The reference here to the passage which speaks of the "holy priesthood," and the enumeration of preaching among the "spiritual sacrifices" which these priests are to offer up, undeniably evinces that our Church claims, for all the "holy nation," the right to preach. If any one

should still feel inclined to doubt this, we would refer him, in order that he may be fully satisfied, to what is said on page 341 : 69. It is there maintained, in proof of the position, that the Church has the right to elect her own ministry, that "this is also confirmed by St. Peter, when he says: 'Ye are a royal priesthood:' these words pertain properly to the true Church, which must have the power to elect and ordain ministers, because it alone has the priesthood." If this argument is not utterly devoid of all point and power, it presupposes that the congregation of believers, being a congregation of priests, must have the right of administering the means of grace. For if the priesthood involves no such right, how could the fact of its possession be used to prove that a congregation has the right to call a minister to exercise it? What relevancy would there be in the reference to the priesthood of believers at all? If the original right to apply the means of grace is vested, not in the royal priesthood of believers, but in a privileged order, which is in no way dependent for its privileges upon such priesthood, our fathers might as well have referred to their nationality as to their faith, to prove their right of ordaining ministers. Before persons charge logic so miserably lame, upon those men of marvellous strength, they should look again, lest the fathers be innocently made to bear the ignominy of the children's absurdities. The priesthood involves the authority to use the means appointed to rescue souls from ruin; the congregation of believers, according to St. Peter, possesses such priesthood; therefore the congregation can appoint its own ministers, being in possession of, and, therefore, able to confer upon the persons chosen all needful authority. This is the argument of the passage in question, and it is as cogent as it is clear.

What is thus taught in our confessions, the principal writers of the Church firmly maintain. We shall have occasion, in a subsequent section, to refer to a number of them and present extracts from their writings; for the present it may suffice to let Luther speak for them all. After showing the necessity of ministers to discharge the functions of the royal priesthood, in the name of all believers, that there may be no confusion and disorder in the exercise of rights which all equally possess, he says: "Now let us speak to the Papistic priests and ask them to tell us whether their priesthood has other functions than these? If it has, it is no Christian priesthood; if it has not it is no special priesthood. Thus we hem them in on all sides: either they have no priesthood

but that which was common to all Christians, or if they have it is Satan's priesthood." W. 10, 1858. Again in his commentary upon St. Peter, he remarks upon 2 : 9: "This belongs to a priest, that he is God's messenger and has a Divine command to proclaim His word. St. Peter says that ye shall declare the praises of God, that is, the wonderful work which God has wrought in bringing you from darkness to light: to do this is the chief work of a priest. When one brother declares to another the powerful work of God, he preaches thus; as ye are redeemed from sin, hell, and death, and all evil, and called to eternal life, so ye shall teach others, also, how they may come to the light." 51 : 400. It will not be deemed necessary to multiply passages upon one of the great Reformer's favorite themes. He is not in the habit of saying things feebly or ambiguously, and what we have presented, states his conviction with such emphasis, that a score of other extracts of similar import, which might easily be collected from his works, would probably avail nothing where these fail to convince.

As, according to the Scriptures and the Church, the application of the means of grace for the saving of souls is a priestly function, and as, according to the same authority, all believers are priests, it follows, incontrovertibly, that the administration of these means belongs originally to all Christians. But conclusive as the argument is, opponents have not failed to make strenuous efforts to evade its force. It is due to those who sincerely differ from us to hear their objections.

3. Opponents say, that while they admit all Christians to be priests, they believe this priesthood to be spiritual, because the sacrifices which they offer are spiritual sacrifices, on which account this priesthood has nothing to do with the ministerial office; secondly, that if all are literal priests, all must be kings in the literal sense also, because all believers are kings and priests unto God; finally, if this priesthood conferred the right of teaching, then women must have the same right, because they are believers also. We shall consider these objections in the order in which they are stated.

4. We do not contend that every priest is a minister of the Church: to confound the Christian priesthood with the pastoral office, is to conceal the truth. When we say, that according to the principles of our National Government, the sovereignty lies in the people, we are far from asserting that every man is an officer in that Government. The Christian

ministry is an ecclesiastical office, exercising powers originally vested in the general priesthood. Therefore the objection, so far as it presumes our doctrine to make the general priesthood and special ministry identical, is entirely irrelevant. The Church is guilty of no such confusion. But when it is said that priests called to make spiritual sacrifices are not real priests, with authority to bear God's grace to men, we must ask for proof. We have given evidence to the contrary, and it will not be expected that an objection without reason will weigh much. It seems as though the objection originated in a very common confusion of "spiritual" and unreal, whereas if anything can claim to be real it is that which is spiritual. There are no priests now by carnal descent, as there were of old; if the assertion, that believers are only "spiritual priests," means this, we heartily accept it; but what has this to do with the right of offering grace? If priests by carnal descent were authorized to do so, the proper inference would be, that priests by spiritual descent have, at the very least, the same authority. If the expression means that priests must be spiritually, not carnally minded, we again agree; but no sane person would offer this as a reason why great rights should be denied them. If it means that they are to minister in spiritual things, we fully concur—the sacrifices are "spiritual," not carnal: for the material offerings made by the Levitical priesthood spiritual sacrifices are substituted; but it is sad logic to adduce this as proof that the authority to act as messenger of God to man must have ceased. The very reverse is far more reasonable, namely, that now, since spiritual have taken the place of material sacrifices, and the Gospel shines more brightly, the priesthood has larger powers than ever. All that the objection asserts merely confirms the doctrine of our symbols; we cannot see how it could be supposed to have any effect towards invalidating our argument, unless persons were guilty of the supreme folly of imagining spiritual things to be unrealities; a folly above which the weakest Christian should be expected to rise. This "spiritual" priesthood of all Christians, is the only real priesthood that exists, and those spiritual sacrifices which they offer to God, are the only sacrifices which He accepts, and those spiritual gifts which they, in God's name, bring to man are the only gifts which save the soul.

2. Just as confused a thing is the second objection, that all must be real kings if they are real priests. Why, so they are! "But they are not such crazy kings as those of the

world. Compared with believers, these are but counters and painted kings, for they rule merely temporally and externally. But believers are real kings; not that they wear a golden crown, or bear a golden sceptor, or deck themselves with silk and velvet and purple and gold; but they are that which is far more glorious, lords over death and the devil, hell and evil. Earthly kings can deal only with gold and silver, money and property, can possess riches and power, can destroy and harass people, can tax and oppress and flay their subjects; but they cannot help themselves, cannot prevent the smallest boil on their fingers or pain in their heads and limbs. Much less can they resist sin, death, the devil, hell, disease, calamities, &c. Therefore they are kings as counterfeits are dollars, or kings painted on cards are kings." Luther 36 : 13. Strange that a Christian should think of denying the royalty of God's children. They have no earthly realm indeed; a golden crown, purple and ornaments belong to kings on cards, they are much too poor for the sons of God; but these inherit a glorious kingdom notwithstanding. They are kings in the same sphere in which they are priests—kings and priests unto God. If it be said that just as spiritual kings have nothing to do with temporal kingdoms, so spiritual priests have nothing to do with temporal Churches, which seems to be the drift of the objection, we would beg the reader to observe, in the first place, that the Church of Jesus Christ is one, and is not temporal, but eternal: in this all are priests, who have indeed nothing to do with religious services in associations of the world, outside of this; and, secondly, that when local organizations of Christians are formed, which, so far as they are separate congregations, are intended for the present world only, and which, in virtue of the authority vested in the priesthood of believers, choose their officers, we do not claim that priests have any more right to interfere with such temporal ecclesiastical offices than spiritual kings have the right to usurp the prerogatives of temporal authorities in the State. The objection, therefore, utterly fails to meet the case; so far as it has any bearing on our argument, it rather serves to confirm it; for as in the kingdom of God, we are all undeniably kings, so, in the same realm, we are all undeniably priests; and, outside of this kingdom, we claim no priestly prerogatives for believers, whilst in it we assert their exercise to be regulated by a Divine law of order, which we are bound to observe, and which, as it requires a public ministerial office, guards against con-

fusion in the congregation by limiting their public exercise, except in cases of necessity, to the minister.

3. "But if the Papists oppose us with the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14 : 34: 'Let your women keep silence in the Churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak: but they are commanded to be under obedience,' affirming that the right to preach cannot be common to all Christians because it is forbidden to women; I reply: We do not permit the dumb, or those who are otherwise unable or unqualified, to preach either. For although every one has power to preach, yet we should not choose any one for this purpose, nor should any presume to do it, unless he has special qualifications. . . . Paul forbids women to speak in the Church, where there are men who are capable of doing it, in order that all may be done decently and orderly, as it is much more proper and becoming for men, and they are better qualified also." Luther 28 : 50. The impropriety of women's preaching and praying in public we fully admit; we deem it immodest and sinful. But to conclude from this, that not all believers are priests, is simply to abuse our reason by argumentation against plain Scriptural proofs; and to say, that on this account, teaching cannot belong to the common priesthood, has just as much warrant as to say that praying does not; for the command to women to keep silence in the Church, forbids public praying just as much as public preaching. Not every man has the qualifications for this, and women are not naturally as well adapted for it as men. But women are priests notwithstanding; and when in their closets they bring their offerings to the Holy One, or in their homes bring God's precepts and promises to their children, they are exercising priestly functions as fully and as effectually as any priest. And when a case of necessity occurs, she may bear the tidings of salvation to benighted souls, and disciple them by baptism, as validly and efficaciously as any ordained minister; for in Christ Jesus "there is neither male nor female; ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3 : 28. This the Church has always admitted. While priests who have not the office are not publicly to administer the means of grace when there is a minister to be had, and while, in case there is none to be had, the duty falls upon women only when there are no men whose services can be secured, yet all have the right, though thus regulated by Divine order, and have it in virtue of their Christian priesthood. We are able to see nothing, in all these objections, to weaken our argument

in the least. It remains an unshaken truth, that all believers are priests, and to the priesthood belongs the offering of God's grace to men, by His appointed means, as well as the offering of man's gifts to God.

II. The keys of the kingdom of heaven belong equally to all believers, not to a select few among them; therefore all believers have originally an equal right to exercise them for the saving of souls. We shall here inquire,

1. *What is meant by the keys?* In the celebrated Harmony of the Gospels, by three of our most distinguished theologians, Chemnitz, Leyser and Gerhard, the question is answered thus: "We must inquire, first of all, what is to be understood by the kings of the kingdom of heaven, which Christ here promises. The reader is reminded that our Saviour, in this conversation with the Apostles, compares the Church to a city or house which He Himself builds. And the Church of Christ is truly His city, in which He gathers the citizens and subjects of His kingdom, and His house, in which He has deposited all His goods and treasures, such as the grace of God, remission of sins, righteousness, salvation, eternal life, &c. . . . The delivery of the keys is an ancient symbol of a certain power committed and intrusted; for he who has the keys has access to everything. Thus when a man commits the keys to his wife, he acknowledges her as his consort, and intrusts to her the charge of the house. In the same way the keys are committed to house-keepers and stewards by their masters, and authority is thus given them over the chambers, cellars, chests, and all their contents. Thus, too, when princes are admitted into a city the keys are delivered to them by the citizens, which is a token that they submit themselves to their power, and acknowledge their authority to admit into, or exclude from the city. This figure our Lord here applies to the Church, the keys of which He promises to Peter and his colleagues, and thus teaches that He will appoint them His house-keepers and stewards, that they may open the treasures to the worthy and admit them to their possession and use, and close them to the unworthy and profane, and banish them from the kingdom of God. Hence Paul says: 'Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.' 1 Cor. 4 : 1. The words, 'keys of the kingdom of God,' therefore embrace all those functions, powers and authority, by which everything requisite for the kingdom of Christ and the government of the Church is performed, which cannot be

better expressed than by this comparison of the keys." Harm. I, 1616, (Ed. 1622.) We are not aware that the correctness of this exposition has ever been disputed; certain we are that it cannot be disputed on Biblical principles. It is, moreover, the uniform interpretation of our confessions, as is manifest both from the identification of the power of the keys with the power of bishops, and from the specification of functions involved in such power. A single passage will suffice to place this beyond controversy: "Accordingly they teach that the power of keys or of the bishops, according to the Gospel, is a power or commission from God to preach the Gospel, to remit and to retain sins, and to attend to and administer the sacraments."The power of the keys is thus seen to be nothing else than the power of saving and edifying souls by the administration of the means of grace. And,

2. This power of the keys is originally conferred upon every believer alike—upon the whole Church of Jesus Christ, not only upon an elect portion. Many as there may be who doubt this, or even positively deny it, it is, nevertheless, susceptible of the clearest proof. The Bible teaches it directly and indirectly, and our Church, here as everywhere, meekly and firmly follows the Bible. We trust no reader will, from prejudice, reject the truth without even weighing the evidence.

1. There is an abundance of indirect proof to establish our position, even if there were none bearing directly upon the point. The Church is the Saviour's bride, the Lamb's wife. "I will betroth thee unto Me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness." Hos. 2 : 19. These were no empty words; they were accomplished, as all Jehovah's words must be. "He that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom," John 3 : 29; and Jesus hath the Bride. Therefore the apostle says: "I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." 1 Cor. 11 : 2. And again, speaking of the relation of husbands and wives, and their mutual duties, he declares: "This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." Eph. 5 : 32. Now, as the wife has conferred upon her equal authority over the treasures of the house with the husband, though submitting herself to him, so has the Lamb's Wife, as such, the free use of the keys in the Lord's house, in submission to His holy will. For the wife does not sustain the relation of a servant to her husband, reaping many benefits

from his wealth, but that of a companion, who is made joint owner of the wealth, with power to share it with others. The analogy suggested would fail in the most important point if the Church had not, as Christ's Bride, the power of the keys. "Therefore let us, as Christians, who should know their treasure and glory, learn to glory in this marriage, rejoice in it and comfort ourselves with it, that we, by the grace of God, have attained to this exalted dignity of being, and being called the Bride of His Son. . . . If thou art become His Bride, thou hast the keys and art the lady of the house, and art in possession of His heavenly treasures." Luther 18 : 312. Because believers are the Lord's Bride, the Scriptures assure us that they are proprietors of all that is in His House, even of the ministers: "Let no man glory in men: for all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come: all are yours." 1 Cor. 3 : 21–2. Therefore, too, the Church is called "the mother of us all." Gal. 4 : 26. If the power of begetting children unto God, of regenerating fallen men, that they may receive the adoption of sons, were the prerogative only of a distinct order of men, independently of the Christian priesthood, not of all believers, then this order, not the Church, would be called the mother of God's children. But if the Church, not a select class, regenerates men, and renders them heirs of heaven, then to her, to the congregation of believers, must belong the authority to administer the means by which alone children can be born unto God.

2. And that which is plainly implied in the passages referred to, is directly affirmed in others. For when the Lord says to Peter, Matt. 16 : 19: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," it would be an ignoring of the context, as well as of the proportion of faith, to limit this to Peter alone. The Church is confessedly not built upon His person, but upon Christ: upon this "living stone" all Christians are founded and built up as "lively stones" into a spiritual house; and although some are first in point of time, and these, being inspired preachers of the truth, which alone supports the Church, are said to form the foundation, yet they are all coördinate in point of rank and dignity. To understand the passage in question, we need

but observe in what character Peter was addressed. And this is easy. The Lord asked His disciples whom they believed Him to be. "Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Upon this confession of Divine truth, which flesh and blood could not reveal to him, he received the keys of the kingdom. The allusion to Peter's name, and designation as a rock upon which the Church is built, forms no difficulty. The truth saves; persons who believe it are established upon it as on a rock; but because the truth brings salvation, the person who declares it brings salvation also: he brings it by the truth. Therefore the confessing person is, in a secondary sense, a rock also: he stands immovable while he clings to the truth, and by his confession and consequent spread of the truth, the building progresses. As this may be said of believers confessing the truth in general, it may be said especially of inspired men. But as the keys are given to Peter, as a believer and confessor of the truth, they of course belong to all who believe and confess, a representative of whom he was. The words of our Lord in Matt. 18 : 15–20, must banish every lingering doubt of this. Here it is the persons instructed to tell each other of their faults when they trespass, who have the promise that their prayers shall be heard, and that Jesus is in their midst, when two or three are gathered together, that form the Church of the living God, to whom the keys are delivered. "O what an advantage it would be for the Pope if this passage were not in the Gospel! For here Christ gives the keys to the whole congregation, not to St. Peter. And to this place belongs also the passage in Matt. 16, where He gives the keys to St. Peter, in the name of the whole Church. For in this 18th chapter the Lord explains His own words, and shows to whom He gave the keys, in the preceding 16th chapter, in the person of St. Peter. They are conferred upon all Christians, not upon St. Peter's person." Luther 27 : 363.

This is unmistakeably the doctrine of our Symbols. The Treatise on the power and primacy of the Pope, appended to the Smalcald Articles, after showing, in opposition to the arrogant claims of the Papacy, that the words of Scripture to which we have just referred, apply just as much to the other apostles as to St. Peter, proceeds thus: "Besides this, it must be confessed, that the keys are not given to one person only, but that they belong to the whole Church, as this can be satisfactorily proved by clear and certain evidences. For

just as the promise of the Gospel belongs certainly and immediately to the whole Church, so must the keys belong immediately to the whole Church; because the keys are nothing else than the office, by which such promise is communicated to those who desire it, as also the practice of the Church evinces that she has power to ordain ministers. And Christ shows, in connection with these words, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind,' &c., to whom He gives the keys, namely, to the Church: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name,' &c." 333 : 24. The attempt which is sometimes made to prove the irrelevancy of this passage to the question in hand, by laying stress on the fact that it is directed against Papa arrogance, is manifestly a miserable failure. We admit the fact to its fullest extent; we would emphasize it; we would entreat those who deny the rights of the Christian priesthood well to consider it. For the words are a solemn protest against Romanizing tendencies beyond the borders of Rome, as well as against the developed hierarchism within them. The design of the passage is to prove the baselessness of the Pope's pretensions, that the keys do not belong to him alone, not even if he were Peter's successor. This is done by furnishing evidence to show that the other Apostles had the keys conferred upon them just as much as St. Peter, and, *in addition to this*, that these keys are given and belong to all Christians, to the whole Church, not even to the apostles only, much less only to one man among them. The argument to establish this is conclusive. The promise of the Gospel belongs immediately to the whole Church, to every believer; every believer must accordingly have power to communicate that which belongs to him, as it is God's will that it should be communicated; but the keys are the means by which alone such communication is made, or can be made, by him: therefore the keys necessarily belong to all. Further: it is a manifest fact that the Church has power to ordain ministers; the right and duty of these is to exercise the keys; but men cannot confer powers which they do not possess: therefore the keys must belong to the whole Church. But there are those who, finding the scope of the argument against them, still strive to discover something in isolated expressions to save them from the ignominy of fighting against, while they profess to be enlisted under, the banner of our Church. Thus it is said that because the keys are styled the "office," by which the promise of the Gospel is communicated, therefore they can belong only to the ministers who hold

the office. This looks like misery. It would be bad logic, indeed, to assert that the evangelical promise, and of course the power of spreading it abroad, belongs to all; but the keys impart the promise; therefore the keys belong to some. And this, too, as an argument in addition to the one presented just before, showing that they do belong to some, namely, to the Apostles. Our fathers are perfectly innocent of this. They prove that the keys cannot belong to the Pope alone, because they belong to all ministers, and more than this, to all believers. The word office, in the passage in question, as in scores of other instances, is evidently synonymous with function. The keys are the means of imparting the promise—their exercise, the function by which it is imparted. Further, it is sometimes maintained that when the keys are said to belong to the whole Church, which, therefore, has the power to ordain ministers, this power is ascribed to the Church, because the ministry, who are supposed to have the power exclusively, belong to the Church. But this is shown to be an error, not only by the argument as a whole, but also by the distinct declaration that the Church is, and the power is lodged, "Where two or three are gathered together in Jesus' name." Not only the Church as a whole, but every part of it, has such power, and where two or three are gathered together, they have authority to ordain ministers, to exercise it, because they have it. No amount of prevarication can make the passage, or any part of it, say anything but that the keys belong to all Christians, and belong to them *principaliter* and *immediate*, as the Latin copy expresses it. The minister, as the steward of the house, has them mediately and at second hand, and exercises them in the name of the master and His Bride.

The same doctrine is also stated on page 341 : 678, and proved by similar arguments. The design is there to vindicate the Church's right to the election of her own ministers. In proof of this it is said: "Where the Church exists there is always the command to preach the Gospel. Therefore the Churches must retain the power of calling, electing and ordaining ministers. And this power is a gift which God has, in the proper sense, bestowed upon the Church, and which cannot, by any human power, be taken away from her, as St. Paul testifies, Eph. 4 : 8: 'He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive and gave gifts to men.' Among these gifts, which belong to the Church, he enumerates pastors and teachers, and adds that these are given for the edification of

the Body of Christ. Hence it follows that where there is a true Church there must also be the power to elect and ordain ministers; as in case of necessity a mere layman can absolve another and become his minister. So St. Augustine relates the case of two Christians in a ship, one of whom baptized the other and then was absolved by him. Here belong also the words of Christ, which testify that the keys are given to the whole Church, not to several particular persons, as the text says: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.'" It will be observed that here the right to elect pastors is based upon the command given to the Church to propagate the Gospel. This propagation is the duty, not of a class supposed to be of a superior order to Christians, but of Christians, who are, on this very account, for the better performance of that duty, to elect, and must, therefore, have the right to elect, persons who should act as their ministers. This duty, and therefore, of course, the means of performing it, belongs inalienably to each believer, so that when it cannot be discharged through the ministry, that is when a case of necessity occurs, each can exercise the keys in his own right. For these are not given only to "special persons"—let the reader mark the words well—but to all. It would seem almost incredible that there should be any controversy about the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, when her symbols are so positive and so plain.

And equally so are her greatest teachers. "The keys are given to him who stands by faith upon this rock. But here we must not have respect to any person who stands upon the rock; for one falls to-day, another to-morrow, as Peter fell. Therefore no one is designated as possessor of the keys but the Church, that is, those who stand upon this rock. The Christian Church alone has the keys, and nobody else; although the Bishop and the Pope may use them as persons to whom the congregation has entrusted them." Luther 15 : 394. "The keys are not the Pope's, as he pretends, but they belong to the Church, the people of Christ, God's people, or the holy Christian people throughout the whole world, or wherever there are Christians. For they cannot all be at Rome, unless the whole world were at Rome, which will not be for some time to come. Just as baptism, the Lord's Supper and the word of God are not the Pope's, but belong to the people of Christ, and are called keys of the Church, not keys of the Pope." Ib. 25 : 364. "They should first show

and establish the claim to a different power from that which is common to the Church; but instead of this they assert it as if it were already shown and established, and bring forward their falsehoods and imaginary differences, declaring that the Church has indeed the right and power of the keys, but their exercise belongs to the bishops. These are flippant assertions, which fall to pieces of themselves. Christ here gives to every Christian the power and use of the keys when he says: 'let him be to thee a heathen man.' Who is meant here? Whom does He address when He says 'to thee?' The Pope? Nay, He speaks to every Christian in particular. But when He says 'let him be to thee,' He not only gives the right and power, but commands and orders its use and exercise also." Ib. W. 10 : 1845. Chemnitz, in speaking of Papistic errors in regard to the administration of the means of grace, says: "In opposition to these tyrannical notions, Luther teaches, according to the word of God, that Christ delivered and commended the keys, that is, the administration of the word and sacraments, to the whole Church." Exam. 2 : 20 (Ed. 1585.) "It is to be considered, in the second place," says Polycarp Leyser, in the Ev. Harmony of Chemnitz, Leyser and Gerhard, "to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven are intrusted. For since Christ here says to Peter, 'I will give to thee,' the Papists would elicit from this also the primacy of Peter, which he is supposed to have received over all, even over the Apostles; upon which again they build the primacy of all those who are their successors in the See of Rome. But here we must observe the context of the whole history in order that we may arrive at the certain, true and indubitable sense. Christ asked all the apostles, whom they declared Him to be? Peter answered in the name of all, and confessed their common faith. What Christ said again to him must, therefore, be referred equally to all. Indeed, what He here declares to Peter alone, he presently, in Matt. 18 : 18, applies not only to the apostles, but to the whole Church." II, Cap. 85, p. 1619. The illustrious Gerhard uses the fact, that the keys were given to the whole Church, as the first Scriptural proof for the Church's right to elect her own ministers, and notices an objection thus: "Bellarium objects that Peter received the keys in the name of the Church, because he received them for the benefit and use of the whole Church, and because he would not use them himself alone, but transmit them to his successors, and communicate them to other bishops and presbyters. Answer:

We admit that Peter received the keys for the benefit and use of the Church, and that he had them in common with other bishops and priests; but we deny that this is to be understood in an exclusive sense, as though the keys were given to Peter and the bishops alone, and not to the whole Church. For as Peter confessed Christ in the name of the Church, not only in the sense that this confession inured to the benefit of the whole Church, but also in this, that in Peter confessing, the whole Church confessed, so also, the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to Peter in the name of the Church, not only because they were given to him for the benefit and use of the Church, but also because the Church received them in the person of Peter, that she might exercise them herself." Loc. Theol. 24, § 87, p. 85. (Ed. Cotta.)

III. The truth, that the grace of God and the means of imparting it to others, are the glorious heritage of all believers, not merely of a select class, is still further confirmed and illustrated by numerous precepts and examples of Holy Scripture.

1. The precepts which imply this, are so abundant, that the only difficulty is to make the selection. For every command to teach and edify, to admonish and comfort, with which the Scriptures abound, must either be confined to the ministerial office, or must be admitted to involve the truth for which we contend, that all believers are equally heirs to the means by which alone such command can be obeyed. But few will be so desperate as to put such restrictions upon God's words addressed to His children in general. "For no one can deny," says Luther, "that every Christian has God's word, and is taught of God and anointed as priest, as Christ says, John 6 : 45 : 'They shall be all taught of God,' and Ps. 45 : 7 : 'God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.' These companions are the Christians, Christ's brethren, who are consecrated with Him as priests, as St. Peter also says: 'Ye are a royal priesthood, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light." 1 Pet. 2 : 9. But if it is true that they have God's word, and are anointed of Him, they are also under obligations to confess it, and teach and propagate it, as Paul says: 'We having the same spirit of faith, according as it is written, I believed and therefore have I spoken, we also believe and therefore speak.' 2 Cor. 4 : 13. And in Ps. 51 : 13, the prophet says of all Chris-

tians: 'I will teach transgressors Thy ways, and sinners shall be converted unto Thee.' Thus it is obvious, here again, that a Christian not only has the right and power to teach God's word, but is bound to do it if he would save his soul and retain Divine grace." 22 : 146. For he has plain commands to this effect. Thus St. Paul says to the saints and brethren at Colosse, not merely to the bishops: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs." Col. 3 : 16. Again he tells the Ephesians, who are now light in the Lord, that they should "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." Eph. 5 : 11. To the Thessalonians he speaks solacing words about the last times, and adds: "Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thess. 4 : 18. And no one can possibly have read the New Testament carefully without having found frequent instances of precepts, encouraging us to exhort and admonish one another in the Lord. "I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another." Rom. 15 : 14. It is evident that the ability to edify must also be exercised. "Edify one another, even as also ye do. . . . Warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men." 1 Thess. 5 : 11, 14. Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death." James 5 : 19, 20. Now, these instructions to Christians, which are met with so frequently in the Scriptures, certainly cannot mean anything else but that the word of God belongs to all alike, and should be used for mutual edification. For no believer will be likely to suppose that Christians are to edify, admonish, rebuke, comfort one another by any other means than the word of God, which is His power unto salvation. And if there be a reader to whom these passages seem inconclusive as proofs for our position, because they may all be referred to Christians in their private intercourse with each other, we would entreat him to consider, that the question here is whether Christians have the right and power to use the means of grace, not whether it is right to use them in this or that particular manner. We by no means identify the Christian priesthood with the pastoral office: our Church never gave the least countenance to such confusion: but we do maintain,

and we have given reason for maintaining, that all Christians have the right and the duty of saving souls by using the only means through which they can be saved. In what order this is to be done is a separate question, the decision of which in no way effects the fundamental one in hand, which is one of right, not of order. The question of order will receive our attention in another place. The passages do conclusively prove that all Christians have the right to use the word of God for the conversion and edification of souls.

2. And numerous examples of such use, recorded in Scripture, also prove it. We have already mentioned some such, showing how Christians, in their joy and gratitude, told the people around them of Christ and the blessedness He came to bring. After the establishment of the Christian Church, this proclamation of truth, by persons not in office, by no means ceased, but rather increased with the growth of the kingdom. Zeal for God's glory and man's good, impelled them to preach the glad tidings of the Gospel. "Thus did St. Stephen, Acts 6 : 7, to whom the Apostles had not commended the office of preaching; still he preached and did great wonders and miracles among the people. So did Philip the deacon, Stephen's colleague, upon whom again the office of preaching was not conferred. Acts 8 : 5. So also did Apollo. Acts 18 : 25." Luther 22 : 147. And so did Aquila and Priscilla, who "expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." Acts 18 : 26. If still other examples should be desired, we would refer to Acts 8 : 3, 4, where it is said: "As for Saul, he made havoc of the Church, entering into every house, and hailing men and women, committed them to prison. Therefore, they that were scattered abroad went every where, preaching the word." It would require an almost incredible degree of attachment to a preconceived opinion, for a Christian to suppose, that those who were scattered abroad by the persecution, were all incumbents of the pastoral office, when every house was entered and men and women hailed. Even Löhe admits that here there were lay preachers, (Kirche in Amt., 43.) That it was possible for these persons, as it is for all others, to do wrong, we of course confess; we confess, too, that the example of fallible men, is never, in itself, sufficient to prove that which they do to be right; but here we have examples which illustrate the right, proved by other evidences, and which, therefore, afford confirmation to our argument, especially as the wrong, if such

there had been in this lay preaching, would not have been left unrebuked.

IV. As a final proof, for the truth of this doctrine, that all believers have the right to administer the means of grace, we would call attention to the grave errors which its rejection involves.

1. It has led to the error of making the efficacy of the means of grace dependent upon the administrator, not upon the administration according to God's word. This is expressly asserted by men who limit these means to a select class. "We are convinced," says Pastor Grabau, Hirtenbrief, II, 3, "that a person arbitrarily chosen by the congregation, can neither give absolution nor distribute the Body and Blood of Christ, but that he distributes merely bread and wine." And again: "Hence it is clear that, ordinarily, God will bestow His blessings by the word and sacraments only through the ministerial office." Ib. p. 45. Statements similar to these are to be found in numerous publications by professed Lutherans, both in this country and in Europe. And if these persons usually insert clauses, by which they would fain preserve the efficacy of the means of grace in themselves, independently of their administrators, this just as usually makes the impression upon unbiased minds, of an amazing inconsistency. Pastor Grabau says that "the office is not merely an order which God has established for the preaching of His word, but a Divinely, powerful, ministerial means, to pour and plant into our hearts the sacred sense and meaning of the word and its fulness of grace." When it is conceded that notwithstanding this, laymen may effectually exhort and comfort, and even absolve, in case of necessity, it is not easy to reconcile this with the statement just quoted. Strive as they may to avoid it, the doctrine of such persons implies that the ministry is necessary to give efficiency to the means of grace, and that when grace is conferred without the office, it is on the same principle that its bestowal is admitted to be possible, in a case of necessity, even without the Divinely appointed means, inasmuch as God is not bound to them. It is easy to perceive that such a doctrine is subversive of the truth that they derive their efficacy alone from God's appointment and promise. The office is not only conceived to be a means of grace itself, but a superior means, upon which the efficacy of the word and the sacraments depends. For, although this is sometimes said to be an unfair presentation of the view of those who deny that the keys belong equally

to all believers, inasmuch as they would not have the office called a means of grace, but only a means of administration, yet it is obvious that if the treasures of Divine grace exist, indeed, for all men, and are intended to be offered by the appointed means to all, but can be obtained only through the ecclesiastical minister, the bestowal of the treasures is conditioned just as much by the minister as by the word and sacraments. And when it is denied that believers are all priests, and the administration of the means of grace is one of the sacerdotal powers which all enjoy—that the keys belong to all, and can be exercised by all—and when it is maintained that these rights and powers belong only to an order called the ministry, it is impossible consistently to hold any other view than this, that the means are efficacious in the hands of ministers, because they have the keys, but never so in the hands of any others, who have them not: for unless this is maintained we see not what advantage is to be derived from denying that the priesthood has the right of using the keys, and that this use is limited to the ministerial office, merely by a Divine law of order. And, as a consequence of this,

2. The rejection of these common Christian rights deprives us of the certainty of God's grace, and, therefore, prevents our hearts from attaining to full peace in Jesus. For our comfort depends not on our past or present experience, but upon God's unchanging grace; and if there should be the least uncertainty in our minds whether God has really made us recipients of that grace, our peace in believing, and joy in the Holy Ghost, would necessarily depart, because we cannot rest assured and peaceful in faith, when we have no solid ground for faith to rest upon. But if the keys are given to an order separate and distinct from the universal priesthood of believers, not to these in general, and their efficacy is dependent upon their administration by members of that order, we never can be fully sure that grace is ours, and very frequently we must be troubled by doubts. For the question must then arise, not only whether the person who dispenses the means comes to us as one of the order to which this right is confined, but also whether there may not be some defect in his title to such dignity. And especially when persons make the right of membership in such order dependent on succession, whether episcopal or presbyterial, when they maintain the order to be self-propagating, as those who deny the priesthood of all believers usually do, does such question

become tormenting. Whether the baptism and the absolution which we received for the remission of sins, and on the ground of which, we would bid defiance to earth and hell if we knew they were given by our Maker, were administered by a person of the authorized order, and whether, even if the appearances were such as to prove him duly received into the order, there was no defective or worthless link in the chain of succession somewhere in the past, on account of which none succeeding it were duly authorized, would be a momentous and harassing inquiry to one who is convinced that the communication of grace is made only through the ministerial office. That we do not find many troubled thus, in fact, does not prove us mistaken in viewing this as a consequence of such false theory; it only proves that among those who teach it, there are not many who have carefully considered the consequences. Generally, sincere men are better than their false views, which influence their own hearts but little, while they conscientiously hold fast truths with which such falsehoods are inconsistent. But whatever may be the fact, or its explanation, in this regard, it cannot be denied that the legitimate consequence of limiting grace to the ministrations of ecclesiastical officers, is the uncertainty of such grace in proportion to the uncertainty respecting the validity of their official claims.

3. Another consequence of such false theory, is that it excludes the administration by laymen, even in case of necessity. For it is scarcely needful for us to repeat, that accord- to the theory we are opposing, those who have not the priesthood cannot exercise it, and those who have not the keys cannot use them under any circumstances. Our Symbols base the right of laymen to officiate, in case of necessity, not upon the supposed abrogation of all law, when an emergency arises, but upon the orginal right of all Christians to spread the Gospel, which is to be done through the ministry, for the sake of order in the congregation, but which is to be done in any way where the rule of order will not apply: for the main thing is to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ, to which the order in which it is to be done, must always be subservient. See p. 341. That this is the ground, upon which Luther based it, is known to all who are acquainted with his works. He acknowledged no right to do wrong by necessity. If the right to administer the means of grace belongs exclusively to an order, by God's command, no necessity, however urgent it may be, can give it to one

who is not of that order. The first necessity always is to do and suffer God's will, and all departures from this, on the pretence of its necessity, is a mere effort to justify a palpable sin by a pretence as palpably vain. Necessity, the most extreme, will not justify the robbing of our neighbor, in order to purchase bread, or the murder of a relative in order to obtain his property by inheritance. Order will yield to necessity, but right never. The members of a household may have an order in the administration of affairs by a steward, and submit to it fully in ordinary times; but when they need bread and cannot secure it in the way of the established order, they will have it notwithstanding; they might rather starve than steal, but they would be guilty of supreme folly if they would rather starve than break through the usual order and help themselves when they have an abundance in store. They would take that which is their own, whether according to the appointed order or not. The case of necessity should point doubting persons to the truth, if everything else failed. For there are none of the Lutheran name, so far as we know, who deny the powers of the laity, in cases of necessity, that is, who deny it expressly, though many do by implication. But it is strange that persons think of exercising powers, in cases of necessity, which they have not, and which no necessity can bestow. Such an absurdity probably never even occurred to Luther and his coadjutors. He insisted on the sacerdotal rights and powers of all believers, on the right of congregations to elect their own ministers, because they had the priesthood and keys, for the exercise of which ministers are appointed, and to exercise these themselves when necessity required it. We would point to the following passage as a clear expression of his doctrine: "And that I may say it still more plainly, if a number of pious laymen were taken prisoners and placed in a wilderness, without a priest consecrated by a bishop, and these agreed among themselves to elect one of their number, whether married or not, and commit to him the office of baptizing, administering the Eucharist, absolving and preaching, he would be unquestionably a priest, as much so as if all Bishops and Popes had ordained him. *Hence it is, that in case of necessity, every one can baptize and absolve, which would not be possible if we were not all priests.*" 21 : 282. The system which limits the power of the keys to the ministry as a special order, cannot, consistently, admit that, in case of necessity, any Christian can use them; for this would involve the double error of sup-

posing that necessity gives powers which are not possessed without it, and, secondly, that it makes right what is positively wrong without it. And,

4. It also trenches upon justification by faith alone. For when it refers us exclusively to ministerial office for the grace which is offered through the appointed means, and teaches that these are effectual ordinarily, only when administered by the authorized order, it is not difficult to perceive that something else than faith is made essential here to justification, namely, the intervention of the minister, and our submission to his acts. To take the Bible and believe it, to hear a neighbor urge its truths, and accept them humbly in faith, gives me no pardon and peace, according to this theory, because the truth is not brought to me by the proper authority. The ministerial work must first be done before the soul can be declared just in Jesus. A ceremonial law must first be complied with—a law which makes it requisite to receive the word and sacraments from the hands of duly authorized clergymen before we can have grace unto salvation. Let it not be said, that if this is in conflict with the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith, then the necessity of the means of grace must be also. It is not so; the difference is manifest. The means of grace are necessary, not as ceremonial observances, but as means for the bestowal of blessings, channels for the conveyance of grace. If there could be faith without them, there would also be salvation without them. But there is no faith without them, and we must always use them, that God may always convey to us the necessary grace to produce and preserve faith. If the word and sacraments were not means of grace, and the Church still insisted upon their being necessary conditions of its bestowal, there might be some reason for supposing their necessity as much in conflict with justification by faith alone, as the necessity of ministerial mediation. For those who claim the latter necessity take pains to ward off the suspicion, as though they supposed the grace to flow through the pastor as through a necessary channel. They still speak of the grace as being conveyed by the Divine word and the holy sacraments which the pastor administers. But if the truth is always in the Scriptures, and the grace in the sacraments of His appointment, how could a person be justified by faith alone, if, in addition to his believing reception of the truth, it were necessary to receive episcopal absolution before his sins are forgiven? The whole theory of those who deny the rights of the common priest-

hood, tends to dim, if not destroy the sun of our system of truth—justification by faith alone. It does so, not only by making a kind of ceremonial observance a condition of pardon, but also by maintaining the necessity of other mediation, between God and man, than Christ's. For if this suffices, then is the promise of the Gospel ours, immediately in the word, and requires no further intervention of an order endowed with special powers, to impart it or render it effectual, just as little as it does to render our offerings acceptable to God.

We have thus shown that the administration of the means of grace belongs originally to all believers, by evidences clear and cogent. The priesthood of all believers involves this; the bestowal of the keys upon all, involves it; the commands to teach and edify, which are given to all, and the examples of obedience recorded, involve it; and, finally, the errors and inconsistencies which its rejection involves, admonish us that it is the only safe ground. We cannot see the least reason for standing in doubt in regard to the question; the Bible and the Church speak plainly and decisively. And few who reverence the Scriptures can find it in their hearts utterly to condemn the Church's doctrine, when they once understand it well. Few will deny the father's and mother's right to exercise priestly functions in their houses, and use the keys in their families, or doubt the efficacy of the means thus used; few will deny the ability of laymen effectually to teach and comfort one another, or doubt their authority to do so; few would suppose that the word declared in heathen lands by one who had no higher claim to authority for doing so than that of believing in Him whom he preached, is utterly null and void. But this teaching in one's own family, this admonishing or instructing brethren in private, this preaching to heathens where there are no organized congregations and ministers, does not render the pastoral office unnecessary, it may be said. Such functions do not render every man a minister. The ministerial office may exist, without being interfered with in the least, even admitting the rights of the laity thus claimed. This is precisely what we maintain. We have been contending for common Christian rights and powers; we come next to consider how these rights, which belong alike to all, are to be exercised in the congregation.

§ 3. *God has, for the sake of order, appointed a special calling to administer these means publicly, in the name of all, and this calling is the ministerial office.*

It does not follow, from the fact of common possession of property by a number of individuals, that each must be administrator for himself. Reason and experience both teach that their common property can be best administered by one person, who should act as steward or administrator in the name of all. Every Christian is possessor of the priesthood and keys, and has the right and duty of exercising them. He may do this by his own immediate action, or by the employment of another to do it in his name. The *public* administration of the keys is to be committed, where a congregation exists, to some person or persons who are skilled and qualified for this, and who are to do it for the congregation by whom they are called; and when a call is given and accepted, all the congregation observes the order and leaves the keys of the kingdom, so far as their public use is concerned, to the chosen public officer, without in the least relinquishing the priesthood and privilege of the keys, as a right of each individual believer, or the authority to use them directly where the established order does apply, *i. e.*, in private, or where there is no congregation.

I. *There is a special pastoral office, or ministerial calling in the Church*, the duty of which is to administer the means of grace publicly. The Scriptures teach the existence of such office, and its limitation to those who are specially called to discharge its functions. "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles?" 1 Cor. 12 : 29. Evidently they are not, and the questions were designed to show that they are not. Not all have the gifts requisite for, nor the call to the public office. "How shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?" Rom. 10 : 15. Therefore Christians are urged to pray for the mission of men with proper qualifications for the office. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth laborers into His harvest." Matt. 9 : 37–8. It would be mere presumption for all, indiscriminately, to undertake the public office; for it cannot be held by all, and some are utterly unqualified for it. That it is in possession of those only who are chosen for this purpose, or sent, the passages quoted sufficiently

prove. And perfectly coincident with the Scriptures are the statements of our Confessions. "Concerning Church government it is taught, that no one should teach or preach publicly in the Church, or administer the sacraments, without a regular call." Augsb. Conf. Art. 14. While the rights of the priesthood are everywhere maintained, the special rights of the public office are also preserved and defended. The two were never confounded by Luther or the Lutheran Church. "It is true, all Christians are priests, but they are not all pastors. For besides being a Christian and priest, he must also have an office and a parish entrusted to him. The call and command make a pastor and preacher." Luther 39 : 255. And this is not merely the doctrine of the great Reformer's maturer years; he taught so from the beginning of the Reformation, notwithstanding that some accuse him of changing his views. For, in 1521, he tells Emser: "Thou sayest falsely that I make bishops, priests and pastors of all laymen, and teach that they may officiate without a call; and, holy as thou art, concealest the fact that I also write, no one should presume to administer the office unless he is called, except in extreme necessity." 27 : 255. So the illustrious writers of the Church always taught. Thus Chemnitz says: "All Christians are indeed priests, because they bring spiritual sacrifices to God, 1 Pet. 2; Rev. 1; and all can and should teach the word of God in their families. Deut. 6; 1 Cor. 14. But not every one can assume and arrogate to himself the public office of the word and sacraments." Exam. 2 : 216. The ministerial office exists in the Church beside the priesthood, neither interfering with the other.

II. *The ministry is a* PUBLIC *office of the Church.* The *public* administration of the means in the Church, is its design. Our confessions lay stress on this point of publicity, as it is essential to the understanding of the character of the office. It will be observed that a distinction is always made between the right to teach, and the right to teach publicly in the congregation; the former belongs to all believers, the latter to such as are called to the public office. Not as though a right belonging to all Christian, extended only so far as its private exercise is concerned, and ceased where its public exercise is demanded. The right remains the same. But one way of exercising it is preferable to another; the immediate exercise of it by each, would render the orderly activity of a congregation impossible. Therefore its exercise

is regulated; the authority, which each believer has, shall be used according to God's will, that all may be done decently and in order; and this will is, that since one can accomplish what many, acting at the same time, cannot, the many should appoint an agent to officiate for them all, the rights of each being exercised by one in the name of all. The right to officiate publicly belongs only to him, who is called, because the call delegates to him the individual rights of each. For any individual to undertake the exercise of his priestly authority in such a case, would be a manifest interference with the equal rights of others, who exercise them through the duly authorized agent of all. The individual, although he is a priest, and possesses the keys, just fully as any person can, still cannot act in the name of others without their appointment. But this activity on behalf of others, by their authority, is that which is peculiar to the office. "No one should teach or preach publicly, in the Church, or administer the sacraments, without a regular call." For since all believers have equal rights in this respect, he who would exercise them publicly, while all the others remain quiet, must have the authority of all. In other respects, the immediate exercise of our common sacerdotal powers is unrestricted. When one presumes to teach publicly, where the people have chosen another to this office, he commits a grievous sin by despising the delegated rights of the congregation. But when one teaches his children at home, or edifies his neighbors by expounding the word of God in private circles, not in public meeting, or goes where there is no congregation, and strives, publicly or privately, to form one, he is doing what every priest has authority to do, notwithstanding the existence of an office which is intended to administer the means of grace publicly in the Church. For private teaching interferes not in the least with the public functions of the ministry, and public teaching, where there is no congregation, interferes not in the least with the teaching of the ministry in the Church. Wherever our confessions and fathers speak of the office, it will be noticed that this limitation of special pastoral privileges to the public administration in the Church, is always expressed or implied; and that for the exercise of the keys, beyond this and beside this, no official character or call is necessary.

III. *The ministry officiates* IN THE NAME OF THE CHURCH. Its essential powers are already in the hands of the Christian priesthood, so that the office was not instituted for the pur-

pose of bestowing powers upon the people of God which they could not otherwise possess. It was intended as an order in which the common rights of the priesthood should be exercised, where circumstances will not permit each to officiate for himself, namely, where there are many with equal rights, the exercise of which, by all, would produce such confusion as to render the attainment of the end in view, difficult, if not impossible. Therefore this order is established, that a minister should be chosen, who should administer the means of grace publicly, as the agent of the rest. That this is Luther's doctrine, is now denied by comparatively few. If any should doubt, let him read such statements as these, and be satisfied: "But one will object, how if one is not called: then he dare not preach, as thou hast thyself often taught. I reply, the Christian is to be considered, as regards this subject, in two different situations. In the first place, if he is in a region where there are no other Christians, he needs no other call than that he is a Christian, internally called and anointed of God. There he is bound to preach to the erring heathens and unbelievers, and to teach the Gospel, by the requirement of brotherly love, though no man should call him. . . . Secondly, if he is where there are other Christians, who have the same power and right as himself, he must not put himself forward, but must wait until he is called and put forward, that he may teach and preach in the place and at the command of others." 22 : 146. "But perhaps thou wilt say: If it is true that we are all priests, and entitled to preach, what must the consequences be? Is there to be no difference among the people, and are the women to be priests also? Answer: Under the New Testament none should wear the tonsure; not because it is evil in itself, for one might be shorn entirely if he chose; but because no difference should be made between the priest and the common Christian, which faith cannot bear; those who are now called priests, should all be laymen like the rest, only that several officers should be chosen by the congregation to preach. So there is a difference only with regard to the office to which one is chosen by the congregation; in the sight of God there is no difference; and several are selected from the multitude only to this end, that they may, in the name of the congregation, administer the office which all have, not that one has more power than another." 51 : 387. "We are all ordained priests in baptism, as St. Peter says, 1 Pet. 2 : 9: 'Ye are a royal priesthood, an holy nation,' and as is said in Rev. 5 :

10: 'Thou hast made us kings and priests unto God." For if we had no higher consecration than that which the Pope or Bishop gives, we never could be priests, nor administer the Lord's Supper, nor preach, nor give absolution. Therefore the bishop's consecration is simply the same as if he, in the name and on behalf of the whole assembly, took one from the multitude, who have all equal powers, and commanded him to exercise this power for the others. Just as if ten brothers, sons of a king, and all alike heirs, elected one to administer the inheritance for them: they would all be kings and equal in power, and still the government be in the hands of one." 21 : 381. "Therefore the Holy Ghost has intentionally avoided giving the name priest, in the New Testament, to an apostle or any office: but it is in the name only of the baptized or Christians—an innate, hereditary name from baptism: for none of us is born an apostle, preacher, teacher or pastor in baptism, but we are all born priests; afterwards persons are chosen from such born priests, and elected to such offices, who exercise the office on behalf of us all." 31 : 350. And this is the doctrine of Luther's followers generally. While the order of the ministry is always observed, and persons are warned against overthrowing it, the ministry still is a ministry of the priesthood, discharging the functions of this in its name. The statements of our most distinguished teachers are inconsistent with any other theory. Thus Leyser says: "As the public office of the Church belongs, ordinarily, only to those who are properly called by the Church, who have the authority, in the name of God and the Church, to loose and bind their hearers, so in case of necessity, this authority recurs to any Christian. For as the power of loosing and binding is promised to Peter, in Matt. 16 : 19, and given to all the apostles in John 20 : 23, so it is bestowed by our Lord upon the Church, in Matt. 18 : 18, which can delegate it, ordinarily, to persons properly called; but extraordinarily, and in case of necessity, every true member of the Church has precisely the same right, and may use it for God's glory and his neighbors welfare." Harm. Ev. I, Cap. 92 : 1748. And Gerhard: "Augustine writes that the Lord gave these keys to His Church, that what she loosed should be loosed in heaven, and what she bound should be bound in heaven. This judgment of Augustine is confirmed by all those texts of Scripture, in which the Church is called wife, Ps. 45 : 10, spouse, John 3 : 29, and mother, Ps. 68 : 13. The keys are delivered to the

housewife by the master of the house; so Christ, the Lord of God's House, which is the Church, Heb. 3 : 6; Tim. 3 : 15, has given the keys to His spouse. The ministers use them, as stewards, 1 Cor. 4 : 1, in the name of the Church, and only ministerially." Loc. 24, § 87, p. 85.

IV. *The ministry acts in the name of all* FOR THE SAKE OF ORDER. The regulation, by which one acts in the name of many, is not a moral nor a ceremonial law, but simply a law of order. It is required, not by the moral, but by the natural necessities of the case. The fundamental law on the subject is: "Let all things be done decently and in order." 1 Cor. 14 : 40. The power to administer the means of grace, belongs originally to all alike; the ministry of the Church is a Divine arrangement, made necessary by the fact that "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace," for their orderly public administration in the congregation, where confusion must necessarily ensue, if each exercised his right without reference to the equal right of others. That our symbols teach this, we have already proved, by showing that they teach the right of all believers to the means of grace, and that they maintain the necessity of a call for their public administration in the congregation. And Luther teaches it expressly. "The Christian Church alone has the keys," he says, "no one else; although the Bishop and the Pope may use them as persons to whom they have been committed by the congregation. A pastor exercises the office of the keys, baptizes, preaches, administers the Holy Supper, and performs other offices in the service of the Church, not in his own name, but in that of the Church; for he is a servant of the whole Church, to which the keys are given, even though he were a knave. For if he does it instead of the Church, then the Church does it; and if the Church does it, then God does it. There must be ministers. For if the whole congregation would rush upon the child to baptize it, they would probably drown it, as a thousand hands would be employed. This would never do. Therefore we must have a minister to do it in the name of the congregation." 15 : 395. No language can be plainer than this. We would not know how more emphatically to state our Church's doctrine, that the keys belong to all believers, but are committed by them to ministers, for the sake of order, to be publicly used in and for the congregation. And this was Luther's doctrine always. We present several extracts from works of different dates, in confirmation of this. "Because all Christians are

called out of darkness, they are all obligated to proclaim the power of Him who called them. This we admit, that many should not preach at once, although they all have power. For when Paul spake, Barnabas was silent. Acts 14 : 2. Must Barnabas therefore have been without the authority to speak? All things must be done decently and in order. 1 Cor. 14 : 40. But this does not abolish the common right to the office of preaching, but establishes it. For if not all had the power of preaching, but only one, what need would there be for commanding and observing order? Just because they all have power and authority to preach, is it necessary to observe order." 28 : 47. These passages were written in 1522 and 1527. In 1536 he writes: "This is not to be so understood as if we rejected the office of teaching and administering the sacraments in the Church. For this is necessary; there must be a certain order observed, according to which certain persons do this, that no confusion may arise." W. 6 : 2119. In 1539: "There must be bishops, pastors or preachers, who publicly and specially administer the four things mentioned above, on account and in the name of the Church, but by the appointment of Christ, as St. Paul says, Eph. 4 : 11. For the multitude cannot do this, but must commit it, or have it committed, to an individual. What would the consequence otherwise be, if each would speak and officiate, and none would give way to the other? It must be committed to one alone, and he must be permitted to preach alone; the rest must all hold their peace and consent to it." 25 : 364. And in another work of the same year: "Thus every Christian has and performs such priestly works. But besides this, there is a common office which proclaims the doctrine publicly, and for this pastors and preachers are required. For not all can attend to the office in the congregation, and it is not proper to baptize and administer the Eucharist in every house. Therefore several must be elected and ordained, who are qualified to preach, and who may exercise themselves in the Scriptures, who shall hold the office of teaching and defend the doctrine, and who shall also, in the name of the congregation, administer the sacraments, so that we may know who has been baptized, and all things may be done in order. Otherwise a Church would be slow to arise, if every neighbor preached to the other, and all did everything without order." 40 : 174. Finally, in 1544: "When we assemble in the congregation, and I preach, this is not my word and act, but is done for the sake of you all, and in

the name of the whole Church. For there must be one to lead and speak the word, by the command and consent of the rest, who all confess the truth by hearing it, and thus are engaged in teaching it also. So when a child is baptized, this is not done alone by the pastor, but also by the sponsors, as witnesses, yea, by the whole Church. For baptism, like the word of God, and Christ Himself, is the common property of all Christians." 17 : 250. The same is implied also, in statements already presented from other writers; but others also make express mention of the Divine law of order as the basis of the ministerial office. Thus Leyser: "Notwithstanding this, the right of every believer, even the humblest, which God has given with regard to the keys, remains unimpaired. For as every citizen of a free city, as many as inhabit it, has, as respects the republic, a common right and equal liberty, and as they elect senators and a consul notwithstanding, for the sake of order, to whom they commit the keys and statutes of the city, that he may administer them in the name of all, and govern the republic in accordance with them: so is it also with the citizens of the city of God. They are indeed a communion of saints, and all things are their's, whether Paul or Peter, or life or death, or things present or future. 1 Cor. 3 : 21. They possess all things under one Head, which is Christ, who by the merits of His blood has acquired everything necessary to salvation for His Church, and for every member of it in particular, even for the least; but yet, for the sake of order, they elect certain persons, to whom they delegate the administration of the keys of the kingdom, such as among us are called deacons, pastors, doctors, bishops or superintendents, &c., that thus all may be done decently and in order, according to Paul's doctrine, 1 Cor. 14." Harm. Ev. 85 : 1621. And Gerhard says: "If no regular minister of the Church is present, the administration of baptism is not to be omitted, because it is by no means essential to this sacrament, that the administrator be a minister of the Church: in such case the order yields to necessity." Loc. 21, § 34, p. 96. But whilst this ministerial arrangement, as our Church incontrovertibly teaches, is made for the sake of order, it is also certain that,

V. *The ministry acts in the name of all* BY DIVINE APPOINTMENT. It is no mere human arrangement, originating in the requirements of expediency. The order to be attained is God's will, and the means of attaining it by the minis-

terial activity of one, in the name of many, are God's institution. Expediency does indeed require the office; but if men did not see it to be expedient, it would be none the less necessary; God sees it to be so; it is a Divine institution to accomplish an object, which can be accomplished only thus. Let no one say we render it a mere matter of indifference whether congregations have the office or not. Christian congregations are obligated to have it, not by a ceremonial law indeed, but by a law of order, which God has been pleased to establish, and which His children are therefore bound to observe. That the ministry is a Divine institution, we could not doubt, in view of the Scripture proofs which establish it. For, in the first place, we find prophecies in the Old Testament that God would give ministers under the new dispensation: "I will give you pastors according to my heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." Jer. 3 : 15. And this, like all God's words, was fulfilled. For, secondly, we read that the Son of God appointed the Apostles to be teachers: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28 : 18. Thus were the seventy disciples also called, according to Luke 10. And not only were these first preachers, who were immediately called to the office of the ministry by the Lord, thus incumbents of a Divine office. Those who are mediately called are so just as well. For, thirdly, those who are called through the mediation of men, are represented as called of God also. St. Paul says to the elders of Ephesus, who were not called immediately: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20 : 28. And again, in Cor. 12 : 28–9, we are told: "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers?" God hath done this, not man. So again, in Eph. 4 : 11: "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." The Divine institution of the ministry is proved, fourthly, by the fact that those who were immediately called of God, recognize colleagues in those mediately called. Thus says St. Peter: "The elders which are among

you I exhort, who also am an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ." 1 Pet. 5 : 1. And St. Paul declares Tychicus to be "a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord," Col. 4 : 7, and Epaphroditus a "companion in labor and fellow-soldier." Phil. 2 : 25. This Divine institution of the office our Church attests, just as distinctly as it does the common right of all believers to the administration of the means which the officer is called to attend to, in their name, for the sake of order. For our Confession declares: "The Church has a Divine command, to appoint preachers and deacons; and because it is very consoling to know that it is God's will to preach and work through men, and those who are appointed by men, it is right to respect and honor such appointment, especially over against the satanic Anabaptists, who despise and revile such appointment, together with the office of preaching and the corporeal word." 203 : 1213. So Luther taught from the beginning. While he declared, that "the right of the community requires, that one, or as many as the congregation choose, should be elected and received to discharge these offices publicly, in the name of all those who have the same right, so that there may not a miserable confusion arise among the people of God, and the Church may not become a Babel." He also asserted that this is required by the word of God, not merely by a natural necessity. "We all have authority to preach," he says, "indeed we must preach God's name—it is commanded us in 1 Pet. 2 : 9, 10. But St. Paul, notwithstanding this, establishes an order, in 1 Cor. 14 : 40. As in a house, there must be an order: for if all the heirs undertook to be masters, affairs would be badly managed, but if all agree in the selection of one, into whose hands they commit the management, while they withdraw, everything moves along well: so here must one be chosen, that the order may not be reversed." 12 : 347. And this regulation is made by the Apostle, not in the exercise of the liberty which belongs to all Christians in things indifferent. It is God's regulation in a matter that is not indifferent. This too is clearly expressed by the great Reformer: "Paul says to his disciple, Titus: 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.' Tit. 1 : 5. He who believes that the Spirit of Christ here speaks and orders through Paul, must be convinced that this is a Divine institution and order, that in

every city there should be a number of bishops, or at least one." 28 : 54. We cannot concede that such statements mean nothing more than that the Church has a mediate, derived command to choose pastors, as Dr. Höfling maintains—that the command is Divine, in the sense that we must feel Divinely obligated to do that to which we are impelled by an inevitable inward necessity. There is, indeed, such necessity for the pastoral office, if the means of grace are to be administered publicly in the congregation, with decency and order. But it pleased God, not only to command the order, but also the means of attaining it, namely, the election of ministers to act in the name of all. We can see nothing more of ceremonial law in this—against the introduction of which, into the Church, Höfling particularly contends—than in the law of order in general. For the right to administer the means, and their efficacy when administered, are not made dependent upon any work to be performed, or ceremony to be observed, as is the case when the common rights of all believers are denied, or the ceremony of ordination is deemed necessary: this would lie open to such an objection: but the mercy of God is magnified by the confession, that He has assisted our weakness and proneness to error, by specifying how, in this particular instance, the general rule of order must be complied with. The sense in which the expressions of our symbols, and of Luther, are used, when they speak of the Divine command to appoint ministers, clear as they undoubtedly are, in themselves, will perhaps be illustrated, in case this were required by any reader, by extracts from the writings of other prominent teachers in the Church. "That the office of the word and the sacraments is instituted by the Son of God also, in the New Testament, is unquestioned. The Church has the command, also, to appoint ministers; and the promise is added, that God approves the ministry of those who are called by the voice of the Church, and separated for the ministerial work." Chem. Ex. 2 : 220. "The principal efficient cause of the ecclesiastical ministry, is the one and only true God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. This is proved by express passages of Scripture." Gerh. Loc. 24, § 49. The pastoral office is thus, according to the Scriptures and Church, shown to be a Divine institution, not a human ordinance. And,

VI. *It is an office distinct from the priesthood of all believers.* This is manifest from the proofs adduced above, to show that there is a special public office in the Church, by

Divine appointment, which publicly exercises powers belonging to all, in the name of all. The priesthood is no public office, no more than citizenship, in a country governed by the people. It possesses all the powers which the ministry exercises, but one cannot be the representative and minister of many, because he possesses them. Others have the same powers and the same rights, on which account the appointment of a minister to exercise them, on behalf of all, is requisite, as we have seen, to prevent confusion, or the trespass by one against the equal rights of all. The pastor thus acts, not for himself, but for others: he has the public office in virtue of the call of a community. He is the servant of a priestly people in the same sense as State officers are the servants of the people who elected them, and in whom the sovereignty is vested. He discharges public functions in the congregation, not because he is something more than other Christians, but because his equals, recognizing the gifts with which God has endowed him, and which render him competent for the work, have designated him to officiate for all, since some one must officiate for the rest, where it is impossible for all to exercise their rights at once in their own persons. This public office is so utterly distinct from the priesthood that there are not only multitudes of priests who are not pastors, but there may be pastors, and probably are such, who are not priests. They should be priests, indeed; congregations should be very careful not to choose pastors who are not such; but congregations, with the best intentions, and despite the utmost care, may be deceived. And where one is chosen, who is not a priest, that is, who is not a believer, he is a pastor still, and his acts are valid and efficacious still. He exercises the powers of others, in virtue of their vocation. The administrator must not, necessarily, be one of the heirs of the property administered, to make his administration valid. "Although the Christian Church is, properly, nothing else than the congregation of all believers and saints, yet, as in this life there are many hypocrites and false Christians—open sinners remaining even among the pious—the sacraments, nevertheless, are effectual, even if the preachers by whom they are administered, are not pious." Augsb. Conf. Art. 8. Therefore, when a pastor is duly chosen, and performs the functions for which he is called, no person has a right to interfere with his office, and exercise the powers of the priesthood publicly in the congregation, on the plea that he is a priest and has, therefore, Divine authority to officiate.

He has no Divine authority to exercise the rights of others without their consent. "It is taught that no one should teach or preach publicly in the Church, or administer the sacraments, without a regular call." Privately, and where there is no congregation, each can, and should, exercise it. But publicly in the congregation it can be done lawfully only by the authority of those who possess the right in common; and the refusal to respect their choice, is selfish and schismatic. Our Church, in her jealousy for the common rights of all believers, never even by implication, spoke lightly of the special rights of the Gospel ministry. She always reverenced God's order, and held it to be a grievous sin to trespass against it. Indeed, instead of disparaging the Gospel ministry, by her doctrine of the general priesthood of all believers, and of the common inheritance of the keys by all, she magnified it. For while she reverences it as the Divine order, for the public use of common rights, she sees in the refusal of an individual to submit to such order not only a sin against God's ordinance, and an infringement of the pastor's delegated rights, but a trespass against the rights of each individual in the congregation who agreed to delegate them. Her earnest contending for the rights and privileges of each and all, involves an earnest defence of the rights and privileges of the ministers called to exercise them, in the name of all. Therefore her writers, in accordance with Art. 14, of our noble Augustana, with great earnestness maintain the prerogatives of the ministry, and condemn the sinful arrogance of erring men, who, on the pretence that every priest is a pastor, or on any pretence, presume to interfere with them. With respect to each errorist, Luther says: "It avails them nothing to say that all Christians are priests. It is true all Christians are priests, but they are not all pastors. For, in addition to this, that he is a Christian and priest, he must have an office and a parish committed to him. The vocation and command makes a pastor and preacher; just as a citizen or layman, may be learned, but is not, therefore, a doctor, authorized to lecture publicly in the schools, or take upon himself such office without being called." 39 : 255. "For if the call and command were not insisted on, there would at last be no more Church; because just as the sneaks come among us, and strive to divide and destroy our Church, so would other sneaks afterwards come into their Churches and divide and destroy them; and thus the sneaking and dividing would continue without end, or until there would be

nothing left of any Church. This is what the devil designs, and strives to compass through such schismatic spirits and sneaks. Therefore our decision must be: either show your call and command to preach, or keep silence and presume not to preach. For here an office is in question, yea, an office of preaching. But an office no one can have without a command and call." 31 : 218. Chemnitz shows that all are priests indeed, but that this does not entitle them to the public office, and then adds: "For not all are apostles, not all are teachers, 1 Cor. 12, but those whom God separates for this office, by a special and regular vocation." Exam. 2 : 216. And Gerhard says: "Neither is there any force in the objection that Peter adds, concerning the pious believers, 'Ye are a royal priesthood that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you to His marvellous light.' For we must distinguish between the general command and vocation which all the pious receive when they are made Christians, and in virtue of which, it is required of them to declare God's praises, by whom they are called into communion with the Church, to confess Him in word and work, privately to instruct their families in true piety, Deut. 6 : 20, to see that the word of Christ dwells among them richly in all wisdom, and that they teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, Eph. 5 : 19; Col. 3 : 16, and to comfort one another with the word of God, 1 Thess. 4 : 18, &c., and the special vocation, by which the administration of the word and sacraments, in the public assembly of the Church, is committed by the Church's public consent, to certain proper persons, which vocation is not common to all Christians, as is manifest from 1 Cor. 12 : 29; Eph. 4 : 11; James 3 : 7." Loc. 24, § 67. But whilst the pastoral office is thus plainly different from the priesthood of all believers, we must lay stress upon the fact, on the other hand, that,

VII. *It is not an order of superior holiness, but simply a ministry.* Although pastors should, by all means, be ensamples to the flock in all piety, yet no man becomes a better or holier man by the call to the ministry. Ministers are not a superior order of Christians, with a sanctity unattainable by the laity. They are poor sinners, saved, if saved at all, by sovereign grace, and, if faithful, not deeming that they have already attained all attainable virtues, but humbly striving day by day, to grow in grace and the knowledge of our Lord

and Saviour. There is an order of men who have higher privileges and titles than other men—the order of priests unto God. But to this order belong all believers: the minister's highest dignity is to belong to this. Here we are all brethren—all one in Christ Jesus. To higher dignities than those which all the sons of God possess, no pastor can attain, and none should wish to attain; whatever may be the difference between men, in talents and stations and offices, faith in Christ, and fidelity in one's place, are the only distinctions of lasting worth: the poorest peasant, who believes, is an heir of heaven; the richest emperor can be no more. It is a great privilege to be a minister of such mysteries as those which pastors are called to dispense: it implies corresponding responsibilities also: but it renders not pastors better Christians than others; and those who think themselves more than the brethren, because of their office, which is but for time, have least understood their calling, and honor it least. They should think of what our symbols say, in full accordance with God's word: "Among other reasons which Gabriel adduces for not administering the sacraments in both kinds to the laity, he presents this also, that a distinction must needs be made between priests and laymen. And I think this is the principal reason why they hold so fast to this abuse at present, that the sacerdotal may appear holier than the lay order. This is a human notion, and whither it leads it is easy to see." 233 : 9. And Luther's words should be well considered: "In itself, there is no difference between bishops, elders, and priests and laymen: nothing whatever to distinguish the former from all other Christians, except that they have a different office committed to them, that of preaching the Divine word and administering the sacraments: just as a mayor or judge is not otherwise different from other citizens, than that the government of the city is committed to him. Those who have introduced such sects among Christians, dividing them into clergy and laity, some shorn and some unshorn; of the shorn ones, some monks and some priests; among the monks again diversities of clothing and diet—those who have invented this, have divided and rent the unity of Christendom. They are the same who have destroyed the Church and the word of God, and, by the old Serpent's subtlety, have sundered the hearts and minds of Christians from the unity in Christ Jesus, as Paul says, 2 Cor. 11 : 3. Therefore the name

bishop, or priest, is not the name of a sect, but of an office. Priest signifies an elder, bishop, a superintendent. Of these such godless men have made orders and dignities. Paul calls them stewards, ministers of Christ and servants of God." 28 : 59. Their highest dignity lies in this, that they are permitted to serve their equals in the administration of holy things. They are ministers, that is, servants, servants of the Church, and because the Church has the command to administer the means of grace, and serves God in such administration, and the minister attends to this by the Church's vocation, in her name, they are, of course, servants of God also. They are so called in Scripture. "Let a man so account of us, as the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." 2 Cor. 4 : 1. Every Christian is a servant of Christ, and is required to be found faithful in His service, just like the servant in the Church's office. But the pastor is a servant in another sense also: he is a minister of the Church, in whose name he performs the work of the priesthood publicly in the congregation. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus sake." 2 Cor. 4 : 5. We are ministers of Christ, of the Gospel, of the Church. "He who has this office is not, on account of the office, a priest, which we all are, but a servant of all the rest. And when he is no longer able or willing to preach and serve, he returns to the common assembly, leaves the office to another, and is not different from any other common Christian. Thus we must distinguish between the office of preaching, or ministry, and the priestly order of all baptized Christians. For such office is nothing more than a public service, committed to one by the whole congregation, who at the same time are all priests." Luther 40 : 171. The minister is God's messenger to men; for it is God who gives the call through His Church; but he is at the same time the servant of the Church, ministering before God in her name, and performing functions which belong to all. He holds the highest office on earth, being an ambassador of God; but on account of this temporal office in the Church, it would be folly for him to suppose himself superior to other children of God and heirs of heaven, to be which is an everlasting honor.

The nature of the ministerial office, as the Scriptures, and our Church in coincidence with them, describe it, is thus, we think, fairly presented. It is the public office of the Church, by which the functions of the general priesthood of believers

are publicly performed, in the name of all; by which the means of grace are administered and the people's sacrifices offered through a person chosen, according to God's law of order, by themselves, and acting in their stead.

---

## ARTICLE IV.

### A BIBLE GLOSSARY.

By Rev. J. B. Bittinger, A. M., Cleveland, O.

In discussing the question of the necessity or desirableness of a new translation of the Scriptures into English, the community has pretty generally come to the conclusion, that the difference between the parties is one of degree rather than of kind. Those contending for a new translation meaning simply a new revision, while those, opposing a new translation, were willing to concede that a revision was desirable, if practicable. The practicability of a revision, is settled by the fact, that this work has often been done with our English Bible, and that the present revision is the resultant of these various revisions. It is, however, no part of the object of this article, to urge the question of revision as either desirable or practicable, except so far as that end may suggest itself to the reader; but simply to show, by a few examples, what changes have, in the course of several centuries, come upon some of the words of our English Scriptures. Whatever imperfections may be disclosed, or suggested, by this course, are chargeable to the mutability and imperfection of language, and not to the translation, or the translators. There are obselete and obselescent words in our Bible, but with these our remarks have nothing to do; there are inadequate and erroneous translations in our version, with these, too, we shall not meddle; nor is our business with words that have been too grossly translated for our refined or prescient sensibilities. We shall deal with those words only, between which and their meanings, such changes have taken place, that they no longer convey the truth to the common reader; words that have lost their authority over their meanings, or meanings, that have renounced their allegiance to their words.

The following are some of the changes of this kind. 1. Words once used in a wider sense, but now restricted to narrower and more specific meanings, viz.: cattle, charity, temperance. 2. Words fallen from an honorable to a humble sphere, as stuff, superstition, addicted. 3. Words allied to this class, but more distinctively moral in their import, now marking pecadilloes but once designating sins, namely: fault, deliciously. 4. Words changed from an active to a passive sense, e. g., fearful, hateful. 5. Words once synonymous, but in the growth of language disynonymised. Some of these changes, it will be at once seen, are of a very serious nature to the unlearned reader of the English Bible. The meaning of a word is that atmosphere of associations which it carries with it; if therefore a term, once noble by all its associations, has in the lapse of centuries, and the changes of society, lost this nobility, it must mislead the unskilled reader by pressing on his attention an unworthy thought where a worthy one should stand; thus unwittingly defiling the word of God.

In the examples, which follow, there is no attempt at an exhaustion or rigidly scientific treatment of the matter, and therefore I shall follow for convenience, the alphabet, selecting such words as best answer the purpose, such a number of them as is consistent with the limits of a Review article.

Addicted.—This word occurs only once in the authorized version of the Bible. 1 Cor. 16: 13, "I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanus, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have *addicted* (τασσω) themselves to the ministry of the saints.) This word has now fallen into a derogatory sense, but in the text it is surrounded by the noblest associations. Milton uses it in a good sense, where Satan, tempting the Son of God, says:

> And thou thyself seem'st otherwise inclined,
> Than to a worldly crown; *addicted* more
> To contemplation, etc.
>
> Par. Reg. 4, 213.

In Shakespeare's time, though both senses were current, the derogatory was the more common; then after a brief career of honor in the pages of the Bible and Milton it again fell into "disastrous twilight" not soon, we fear, to emerge.

Allow.—This word to the common reader now means "permit," but in the day of our translation, a century earlier,

it meant to "approve." "Truly ye bear witness that ye allow (συνευδοκεω) the deeds of your fathers; for they indeed killed them (the prophets) and ye build their sepulchres." Luke 11: 48. Still more strongly, Rom. 7: 15. For that which I do, I *allow* not: for "what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." Here "allow" is opposed to "hate" in the latter part of the verse. Shakespeare in the multitude of passages, in which he uses "allow" in the present signification, has one in which the old meaning prevails or at least predominates.

> I will *allow* the occasion of our arms,
> But gladly would be better satisfied,
> How, in our means, we should advance ourselves
> To look with forehead bold and big enough
> Upon the power and puissance of the King.
>
> Henry IV, pt. 2. 1, 3.

Artillery.—This term has now come to designate heavy ordnance only; but formerly it was applied to projectiles of all kinds. In 1 Sam. 20: 40 the only passage, in which it is used, it means a bow and arrows as is evident from verse 38. "And Jonathan gave his artillery LXX τα σκευη Heb. כלי unto his lad and said unto him go carry them into the city 1 Sam. 20: 40. Milton and Shakespeare both use the term in its widest and first sense; but the formidable nature of cannon among projectiles soon drew the term to themselves. This tendency is noticeable even in the writings of Shakespeare.

> Turn thou the mouth of thy *artillery*,
> As we will ours, against those saucy walls;
> And when that we have dashed them to the ground,
> Why then defy each other!
>
> King John II, 2.

The phrase "heaven's artillery" is not Milton's, but was used before his time by Shakespeare. Tam. of Shrew, Act 1, Scene 2.

By-and-by.—Man's procrastinating disposition seems reflected in this little phrase. Once it meant *immediately*, with nothing intervening, but, in our tardy nature, it has been drawn out to mean "pretty soon," and so the simple reader misses his Saviour's teaching. Matt. 13: 21, "Yet hath he no root in himself, but dureth for awhile; for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, *by-and-by* he is offended;" and still more his warning in Luke

21 : 9, "These things must first come to pass, but the end is not *by-and-by*." We observe in Shakespeare marks of the vacillation between promptness and procrastination.

> I dare not drink yet, madam ; *by-and-by*.
>
> Hamlet V, 2.

CABIN.—An apartment in water-craft, and also applied to rude and small structures as "a log-cabin." In Jer. 37 : 16, the only passage in which the word occurs, it signifies a sort of inner prison, probably a cell. The idea of the original term is that of restraint, constriction.

> Ere the babbling eastern scout,
> The nice morn, on the Indian steep
> From her *cabined loop-hole peep*.
>
> Comus.

> As broad and general as the casing air ;
> But now I am *cabin'd, cribb'd, confined, bound in*.
>
> Macbeth Act III, 4.

CARRIAGE.—A vehicle, generally for pleasure ; but formerly it applied to that which *was carried*, and not to that which *carried*. After the same analogy we have *baggage*, that which is bagged ; "luggage" what is lugged. 1 Sam. 17 : 22, "And David left his *carriage* in the hand of the keeper of the *carriage*," v. 17, 18 show that this *carriage* consisted of ten cheeses, ten loaves and parched corn, also Is. 46, 1 ; Jer. 18 : 21. Acts 21 : 15, "After these days, we took up our *carriages* (Cranmer's Bible "burthens") went to Jerusalem. Carriages and carriage roads were unknown to that country. There is no ascertained instance in Shakespeare of *carriage* as properly meaning the thing carried. Where Osric, in speaking with Hamlet uses the word "carriages" in the sense of something carried, the prince asks, "What call you carriages ?" to which the courtier replies, "The carriages, sir, are hangers." Hamlet rejoins, "The phrase would be more germane to the matter, if we could carry a *cannon* by our sides ;" "Gun-carriages" being a current and accredited word. This sarcasm of Hamlet seems to imply that the word was not properly used, or at least not current, and this conjecture is favored by the Bishop's Bible rendering the word in Acts 21 : 15, "burthens" and the Genevan translation "fardeles.,'

CHARITY.—This word has shrunk in its generous meaning from universal love to love in one direction—alms-giving.

Its restriction to this kind of love is probably due to the predominance of the Romish religion in England and its influence on the English language. The persistence of this meaning in the conjugate "charitable," as prefixed to "institution" is another evidence of the fact. Its presence in our translation especially in the *locus classicus*, 1 Cor. 13, was due to the influence of the vulgate, on Wiclif and other prelatical translators. In 1542 when the question of a new translation of the New Testament was proposed in convocation, much time was spent in discussing the question, whether "charity" or "love" should be used in translating "charitas." The Bishop of Winchester suggested that for the sake of the majesty of meaning in some of the words, they should not be translated, and among these majestic remains is "charitas," now become rather unmajestic to the plain reader of King James' version and withal somewhat deceptive. The conflict between "love" and "charity" is strikingly illustrated by the following parallel passages: Rom. 13: 10. Wiclif, Cranmer, the Rhemish no less than Tyndale and the Genevan agree in saying *love* worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore *love* is the fulfilling of the law," but in 1 Tim. 1: 5, Wiclif, the Rhemish and the authorized version say, that the end of the commandment is "charity," while Tyndale and Cranmer and the Puritan translators, of Geneva say "love." The following words of Milton as to the victory of "charity" over "love" seem almost prophetic.

> Only add
> Deeds to thy knowledge answerable, add faith,
> Add virtue, patience, temperance, add *love*,
> *By name to come call'd charity*, the soul of all the rest.
> Par. L. XII, 581–585.

Cheer.—In the days of Wiclif "cheer" was the face, even as late as Shakespeare it still had this meaning, though already giving way to the idea of "food" and "feelings" as arising from a well-lined stomach; Milton also uses it in the last two senses, but in the English Bible, with the exception of the marginal reading of Prov. 17: 1, where the idea of "food" is retained, it always translates, θαρσεω=take courage, or ευθυμος=good courage, and the Hebrew phrase for "fear not," but in our day, the noun in the singular, even with "good" prefixed to keep it in countenance, has sunk so low as jocularly to represent only "the creature comforts" of the table. I am glad to say that none of its paronyms have

fallen so low. "Cheerful" and "cheerily" and even "cheers" come from the heart, but "good cheer" is confined to eating and drinking.

And while he preied, the likenesse of his chere (προσωπον) was chaunged.
Luke 9: 29, Wiclif's trans. 1380.

All fancy-sick she is, and pale of *cheer*.
Midnight's Dream III, 2.

All things, that are ordained festival,
Turn from their office to black funeral:
Our instruments, to melancholy bells;
Our wedding *cheer*, to a sad burial feast.
Rom. & Jul. IV, 5.

The feast and noon grew high, and sacrifice
Had fill'd their hearts with mirth, high *cheer* and wine
When to their sports they turned.
Samson Ag. 1613.

Be of *good cheer*:
You're fallen into a princely hand, fear nothing.
Anto. & Cle., V, 2.

He ended, and his words their drooping *cheer*
Enlighten'd, and their languish'd hope reviv'd.
P. Lost, VI, 496.

Coast.—Now limited to the land bordering the sea, but when our version was made, it had not yet departed so far from its Latin root, *costa*, a rib, the side. It then designated any side, whether of land or water, river or country, including also the contents of boundaries. Acts 19: 1, "upper *coasts*." τα μερη, Rhem. *partes* i. e., the table lands of Asia Minor, Matt. 8: 34, coasts το οριον, boundary, Rhe. quarters, Matt. 15: 21, coasts τα μερη, region or as its equivalent still lingers in the phrase now no longer elegant, "these parts," Rhe. the quarters. We still say indifferently: "sea-side" or "sea-coast," and in England country-*side* is still current in the sense of the country. Milton uses it in its wide sense, when he describes Satan as speeding "toward the *coast* of Earth beneath."

College.—Whatever meaning our translators attached to this word in 2 Kings 22: 14, and 2 Chron. 34: 22, it is certain that it did not mean what "college" now means. The LXX, in these passages, merely transferred the Hebrew term into Greek, [*masena, masenai;*] but in Neh. 11: 9, and Zeph. 1: 10, they translate it "the second." The Vulgate

renders the Hebrew uniformly "the second;" i. e., the second part of the city. This would then designate *Bezetha*, i. e., new city; called also, with the surroundings of *Akra*, &c., "the lower city," in distinction from the city of David, which was "the upper city." Zeph. 1: 10, shows that "the second" is opposed to "the hills." Now Josephus speaks of "the other city;" i. e., the new part—the part *added* to the old city of David. Is not therefore Bezetha which was lower than the city of David, built later, and in one sense another or second city as added (*con* and *lego*) to the old city, *the college* in which Huldah dwelt? Let the simple reader bear in mind that colleges for women were not then in vogue.

COMFORTABLE.—Now never active, when applied to living agents, though we speak of "a comfortable house," "seat," "living," etc.; but in the only passages of scripture, in which it is used, 2 Sam. 14: 17, Zech. 1: 13 it is active, and not passive. Gov. Bradford said of the martyr Barrowe—"he was very *comfortable* to the poor.

> O, *comfortable* friar! where is my lord?
>
> Rom. & Jul. V, 3.

The current of all this class of words runs from the active to the passive signification.

COMMUNE.—This word and its conjugates illustrate in a remarkable manner the changes in their significations, which words of the same family may, in a short time, undergo. When our translation was made, *commune* always designated the converse, which was held with another, now it just as exclusively means converse with one's self. *Commune*: Ex. 25: 22. *Communed*: 2 Kings 22: 14. *Communication*: now objective as then, but with this difference, whereas it then marked an oral, it now marks a written intercourse, with the idea of distance attached to it. Matt. 5: 37, "Let your communication, (λογος). Wiclif: *word;* Rhe.: *talk;* Eph. 4: 29, "Let no corrupt communication, (λογος). Wiclif: *evil word;* Rhe: *naughtie speache.* In 1 Cor. 15: 33, "Evil communications (not λογοι but ὁμιλιαι i. e. companionship,) corrupt good manners." *Communing* however again follows *commune*, Gen. 18: 33. But *communicate* again leaves the common household and does service not in *words*, but in *works*, Phil. 4: 15, "No church communicated (Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, bare part with,) with me, as concerning giving and receiving, bnt ye only." "Then *commune*,

how that day they best may ply their growing work. Par. L. IX: 201.

> Katharina, you may stay;
> For I have more to *commune* with Bianca.
>
> Taming the Shrew II: 1.

CONCEIT.—This word illustrates the downward tendency of Ethico-intellectual terms. Rom. 12: 16, "Be not wise in your own *conceits.*" Wic.: prudent anentis yourself; Tyn. Cran. Gen.: wise in your own opinions. In the idiom out of *conceit* with, the better sense is still retained; but in the more open forms of speech the old glory has departed.

> Or, if I live, is it not very like,
> The horrible *conceit* of death and night.
>
> Rom. & Jul. IV, 3.

CONSIDER.—Now exclusively an act of the reflective faculty, but formerly including also the perceptions. Lev. 13: 13, "Then the priest shall *consider*, (ראה LXX ὁραω: look upon or at) and behold if the leprosy, etc. In Matt. 6: 26, Behold (εμβλεπω) the fowls of the air and the word advances one step further, and v. 28 *consider* (καταμανθανω) it passes over into the domain of reflection, where we now find it. Definitions like stars have their periods of occultation, and "consider," in its first signification, has suffered eclipse, so that the unschooled reader, in looking over God's word, sees this spot luminous no longer, but only darkling.

CONVERSATION.—Now speech as a part of conduct, but once, conduct as a whole. 2 Peter 2: 7, "And delivered just Lot vexed with the filthy *conversation* of the wicked." This transition from the whole to a part is full of significance, for the tongue is the index of the man. Nay it is this rudder of his mind, so that if he uses that right, it will direct all his steps. Jas. 3: 2.

> So smooth he daubed his vice with show of virtue
> That, his apparent open guilt omitted,
> I mean his *conversation* with Shore's wife,
> He lived from all attainder of suspects.
>
> Rich. III, III, 5.

CURIOUS.—Dreaming something singular, but not neccessarily implying skill or care, but when our version was made, the word still lived under the shadow of its Latin origin, and carried something of its hue. Ex. 28: 27, 28, "curious girdle."

For *curious* I cannot be with you,
Signior Baptista, of whom I hear so well.
The Tam. of the Shrew, IV, 4.

CUNNING.—Now, fallen into dishonor, when applied to human conduct or character, but formerly of good repute: Ps. 137: 5, "if my right hand forget her *cunning.*" Ex. 39: 8, "he made the breast-plate of *cunning* work." Prov. 19: 25, "Smite a scorner, and the simple will beware (margin cunning.)" "Cunning" and "knowing" come to us, the former through the Indo-germanic channel, the latter through the Pelasgic, and though they have not met, since they parted on the plains of Asia, both have lost their former good name—*a knowing man* is no better than *a cunning man.* "Knowledge puffeth up" says Paul, and spoils men now as it spoiled our mother Eve in Eden.

DAMNATION.—Current only in the harsh sense of eternal punishment, but in the Bible, to express this its strongest meaning "eternal" or "hell" were joined with it: Matt. 23: 33. Even then the word referred to the *sentence* rather than to its *execution.* Hence according to our associations "condemnation," instead of "damnation," is the sense in 1 Cor. 11: 29, "Eateth and drinketh *damnation* to himself." 2 Peter 2: 1, "*damnable* heresies" (Wiclif: sectes of perdicioun) is not from κρινω but from απολυμι signifying destruction, however, "damnable being used to translate this strong word shows how it came to have its present meaning.

DARLING.—Except as a term of endearment, and then mostly as a diminntive, this word is now never heard; the adjective is, but even that is somewhat derogatory. When our version was made, it translated the Greek, "only begotten," meaning *very dear;* also the Hebrew "only one," "solitary one;" Ps. 22: 21, 20, "Deliver my darling, ('my only one,' i. e., soul,) from the power of the dog." So too, Ps. 35: 17, "Lord, how long wilt thou look on? Rescue my soul from their destructions, my darling from the lions."

DEALINGS.—Is now almost exclusively a commercial phrase; it is seldom heard of conduct, or intercourse in general; but this last was its exclusive sense, when our translation was made: Ps. 7: 16; 1 Sam. 2: 23, Eli to his sons: "Why do ye such things? for I hear of your evil dealings (wicked deeds) by all this people." John 4: 9, "For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaratins;" Rhem. "do not communicate with;" Wiclif, "usen not not to dele with;" Geneva, Tyndale and Cranmer, "meddle not."

DEBATE.—Now discussion, but formerly altercation, nearer the French word "battre," to beat. 2 Cor. 12: 20, "lest there be debates," ερεις, Tynd, Cran, Gen.: debates; Wiclif, Strywyngis, Rhem, contentions. So Is. 58: 4, "Behold ye hold fast for strife and debate (LXX μαχας) and to smite with the fist of wickedness." But Prov. 25: 9 "debate" is used in a forensic sense, very near our word—arbitrate. The history of this word shows that society tends from "blows" to "words" from "assault and battery" to logomachy. Or to borrow a plume from Milton, civilization tends "to open man's contracted palm into a graceful and ornate rhetoric." This is one of the few words in our version, which paint the Bible times better than they were, and better than their writers made them, but the same causes which mollified the manners of men, also softened their speech.

DECENTLY.—This word occurs only once, 1 Cor. 14: 40, "Let all things be done *decently* and in order." The word which it twice translates "honestly," Rom. 13: 13, 1 Thes. 4: 12, is used only three times in the New Testament, though it has half a dozen paronyms. In current speech this word is allied to modesty, but in the time of the translators it had a meaning, embracing propriety in general. Shakespeare uses the word only once, but then in the firmer and wider sense, and when Queen Katharine pleads for her waiting maids and declares them "for honesty and *decent* carriage," worthy of the best of husbands. So Milton, in describing Satan under the guise of a cherub, says:

> Wings he wore
> Of a many a colored plume sprinkled with gold:
> His habit fit for speed succint, and held
> Before his *decent* steps a silver wand.
>
> Par L. III, 644.

DELICIOUSLY.—Now characterless, but once blame-worthy. Rev. 18: 7, 9, "How much she hath glorified herself and lived *deliciously*, and the Kings of the Earth, who lived *deliciously* (Tyn. Cran. Gen. lived wantonly,) with her." The character of this living is clearly set forth v. 3, "abundance of her *delicacies*," (Tyn. Cran. Geneva: abundance of her pleasures.) The Greek (στρηνιαξω literally, to live hard) is equivalent to our phrase "to live fast." Has "deliciously" a history like "debate" with the same flattering moral? Is the race less voluptuous under the pure sway of Christianity

as well as less pugnacious under her peaceful reign? Or is the word a euphemism? We can hardly believe that the men, who prepared the authorized version, would have dwelt in euphemistic terms, that was not the temper of the men, nor of those times, nor of other parts of their work. The secret is probably here, they followed the vulgate instead of the Greek. But one fact remains, pleasure is debasing and when men *live* in pleasure they live in sin. Shakespeare and Milton both use this word, but not in this bad sense. It being Latin and therefore less current, perhaps never common, it did not descend, but rather ascended in its associations, so that it is purer now than it was three centuries ago.

Desire.—With us always marking the forward action of the affections, but then also their reflex action, meaning the same as "regret." 2 Chron. 21 : 20, "He reigned in Jerusalem eight years and departed without being *desired*," contracted from "desidero" to be desiderated i. e., missed, which is the feeling of one of its phases.

Disciples.—Except as assumed by the followers of Alex. Campbell, this term is now used, we think almost exclusively as equivalent to "the Apostle." It is also worthy of remark that the sanctity of our associations pertains to the plural number only, the singular of both words conveying a slight disparagement. In Bible laguage however "disciple" meant a learner of the christian doctrines, hence a "believer." This marked character, the other function, Acts 6 : 1, "And in those days, when the number of the disciples, i. e., professed followers of Christ, was multiplied, etc." But v. 2, "Then the *twelve* i. e., apostles, called the multitude of the *disciples* unto them, etc. It is a pity so good a word as disciple—a learner should have given place to "professor," a proficient, when it is evident that the learner of the primitive church knew more than the professor of our times.

Doctor.—Used only in honorary titles, as LL. D., D. D., Ph. D., Mus. D., M. D. In the last, it is active and means a physician, in the others it is passive, but in our translation it is always and only active. The singular number occurs only once, Acts 5 : 34, "Then stood there up one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel a Doctor of Law (νομοδιδασκαλος.) The plural is used twice, Luke 5 : 46, "they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors" (διδασκαλοι) Luke 5 : 17, "doctors of the Law (ν. δ.) Shakespeare knew only the physician as a "doctor," but Milton

mentions also the doctor of the schools and the doctor as simply a teacher.

> For of such doctrine (atheism) never was there school,
> But the heart of the fool,
> And no man therein *doctor* but himself.
>
> Sam. Ag. 299.

> O foolishness of men! that lend their ears
> To those budge *doctors* of the Stoic fur.
>
> Comas 707.

> But vow, though the cross *doctors* all stood hearers,
> For one carrier put down to make six bearers.
>
> Milton.

Duke.—When this word was adopted as an equivalent for אלוף chieftan, LXX ηγεμων possibly a dukedom was not as elevated a rank as it has since become in England; it retained more of the military "dux" than it now does, and in that sense well represented the headsman of those predatory tribes, whose hand was to be against every man. To our ears and even to English ears, "duke" quite leads astray the mind from the real import of the passages, in which it is found. *Vide* Gen. 36: 40–43. These are the names of the dukes (leaders) of Esau, etc.

Equal.—In the days of our version, equal meant "fair," "just" and other ethical properties of acts Ez. 18: 25, "Is not my way equal?" תכן: to make even, LXX κατευθυνω. Col. 4: 1, "Masters give unto your servants, that which is just and equal." Wiclif retains the material basis of the figure by translating the passage "just and evene." In the compound "even-handed" this old meaning is still preserved, but everywhere else "even" and "equal" have sunk back to their material sense. The ethical quality is found in some of the conjugates, as in that excellent word "equity" which is better than justice. Among the many passages in Milton, where the word is found, the following is the only one where the ethical sense yet remains in the word.

> As my will
> Concurr'd not in my being, it were but right
> And *equal* to reduce me to my dust.
>
> P. L. VIII, 748.

Shakespeare even does not use the word in its moral sense. This is indirect testimony to the archaic character of much of the language of our version, even in its own day.

ESTIMATION.—Now moral; then pecuniary. Lev. 27, passim.

ESTATE.—Is used, in our version, as synonymous with "state," the "e" is otiant as is common in many French forms of the Latin. The singular form of the word is used only once in the political sense. Acts 22: 5, "all the *estate* of the elders." So too the plural in this sense is used only in Mark 6: 21. "Herod made a supper * * * his chief *estates.*" This latter sense is not current in our country, as we have not the thing which the word designates; the political meaning of the singular is retained in our diction, but comes to us from the French *tier etat.* Once the plural "estates," Ez. 36: 11, is used in the sense of property but in all other instances it, where the word is used in the singular, means condition or state; whereas it is now applied to property, real and personal, especially as referring to its departed owner. It is a sad commentary on the covetous tendencies of the age, that a man's condition should be set forth merely by his pecuniary circumstances. In the phrase "in mind body and estate" the book of Common Prayer still preserves the Bible sense, so too Milton wherever he uses the word.

> But conjugal affection,
> Prevailing over fear and timorous doubt,
> Hath led me on, desirous to behold
> Once more thy face, and know of thy *estate.*
>
> Sam. A. 742.

EXACTOR.—This word comes to us surrounded by tyrannical associations. The exercise of authority tends to induration, so that after a few centuries, the mere overseer. Is. 60: 17, "I also will make thy officers peace, and their exactors (LXX επισκοποι, the word rendered "bishops" 1 Tim. 3: 2, Jer. 1: 7,) "righteousness" becomes a tyrant, Luke 3: 12. "Exact (πρασσω) no more etc., (Tyn. Cran. Gen.: require no more.) Wic. Rhem. "Do nothing more than is appointed to you."

FAIRS.—In our day, this term is used of those public expositions of goods still maintained in parts of Germany, Italy and Russia. In our country, the term has a similar application to the exposition of fancy articles at "Ladies' Fairs;" but, with this single exception, "fair" means an exposition merely, never for purposes of sale. We have State and county agricultural fairs, meaning "shows," and so these expositions are called in England. But in the days of our

translation, "fair" was the English equivalent for the Greek "agora," a market place, and then the merchandize of the market place; Ez. 27: 12, 14, 19, "with silver, iron, tin and lead, they traded in thy *fairs;* they of the house of Togarmah traded in thy *fairs* with horses," etc. The Douay version uses "fair" and "market" interchangeably, in the passage cited from Ezekial, "Fairings" is the verbal reminisence of this kind of institution, showing that there was a strong social element in this kind of market.

> Sweet hearts, we shall be rich ere we depart,
> If *fairings* (presents) come thus plentifully in.
>
> Love's Labor Lost, V, 2.

Faithful.—Now always passive, meaning trustworthy; once active as well as passive. Luke 19: 17, "Well thou good servant, because thou hast been faithful in a very little." Gal. 3: 9, "So then they which be of faith, are blessed with faithful (Wic. feithful) Abraham." So in the question: "Who was the most faithful (full of faith) man? John 20: 27, "Be not faithless (απιστος) but believing, (πιστος) as rendered by various versionists shows that "faithful" was then already vacillating between its allegiance to the active the passive sense; the passive prevailed here, as in many other words. Wic. Gen. and Rheims. use it actively, Cranmer and Tyndale substitute believing for the active sense. The Genevan preserves the contrast according to the Greek, "Be not faith-*less*, but faith-*full*." This same contrast is found in Milton, but in a different sense, showing still the instability of the meanings, now become fixed.

> So spake the seraph Abdiel faithful found,
> Among the *faithless*, *faithful* only he.
>
> Par. Lost, V. 897.

In Shakespeare, as in Milton, the passive predominates, though the active occurs in the following line.

> That as I am a Christian faithful man
>
> Rich. III, I, 4.

Fame.—Then, anything reported, from the Greek, φαω, and in our Bible so used; but now designating that favorable report which constitutes public honor. Matt. 4: 24, "And his fame (ακοη) went through Syria," Luke 4: 14, "And there went out a fame (φημη) of him," Luke 5: 15, "But so much the more went there a fame (λογος) abroad of him." Wiclif "and the *word* walked about the more of him." This more

extended and radical sense of the word is preserved to us in the legal phrase, "common-fame."

> Regardless whether good or evil *fame.*
>
> P. L. XII, 47.

Fashion.—Except in the idiomatic phrase, "after a fashion," the old meaning has entirely disappeared, since King James' time. "Fashion" is simply the reigning mode or style of society; but once it was the make (*facio*, then *facies* face) figure, form, manner. 1 Cor. 7: 31, "for the fashion (σχημα Wic. and Rheimish, figure) passeth away." Phil. 2: 8, "And being found in fashion (σχημα, Rheim.: similitude, Gen.: appearance, Cran. and Tyn.: apparel, Wiclif: in abite) as a man." We can see how from its original application to the external of things, it finally fell to its present "low estate."

> Peace, Brother, be not over exquisite
> To cast the *fashion* of uncertain evils.
>
> Comus, 360.

Fault.—Fault and its derivatives now mark merely small delinquencies, peccadilloes; but when our Bible was translated, this word and its kindred marked grave offences, sins. Gen. 41: 9, "I remember my fault (LXX. αμαρτια). Jas. 5: 16, "Confess your faults (Wic. Rhe.: sins,) one to another."

> Millions of spirits for his *fault* amerced of heaven.
>
> Par. L. II, 609.

Fearful.—Now always active, causing fear; once both active and passive, with a preponderance in favor of the latter. Mark 4: 40, "Why are ye so fearful?" Wiclif, "What dreden ye?" Shakespeare uses it and its conjugates in the active, though most commonly in the passive sense.

> Tush, Tush *fear* (make afraid) boys with bugs!
>
> Tam. a Shrew, 1, 2.

> By east and west let France and England mount,
> Their battering cannon, charged to the mouths,
> Till their soul-*fearing* clamors have brawl'd down
> The flinty ribs of this contemptuous city.
>
> King John, II, 2.

Folly.—Has lost much of its moral significance, since our version was made, especially in the Old Testament. Like "fault," it now designates the lighter kinds of wrong, but once the most grievous. Gen. 34: 7, "because he had wrought *folly* (נבלה LXX ασχημον) in Israel. Deut. 22: 21,

"because she hath wrought folly (נבלה LXX αφροσυνη) in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house." 2 Tim. 3: 9, "folly" ανοια is moral not intellectual.

> See with what heat those days of hell advance,
> To waste and havoc yonder world, which I
> So fair and good created, and had still
> Kept in that state, had not the *folly* of man,
> Let in these wasteful furies.
>
> Par. L. X, 619.

In applying this term to woman's first false step. Shakespeare, "She turned to *folly*, and she was a whore." and Goldsmith, "When lovely women steeps to *folly*, etc," seem to have used the Scripture term, which had become technical, to designate this sin. "The fool" in that day was the wicked man.

> The *foolish* shall not stand in thy sight;
> Then hatest all *workers of iniquity.*
>
> Ps. 5: 5

Forwardness.—As applied to conduct, this term is now derogatory, but once it was praiseworthy. 2 Cor. 9: 2, "For I know the *forwardness* of your mind (Rheim.: prompt, Tyndale: redynes) for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia." The phrase "in a state of forwardness" is still in use but is morally indifferent. The only other passage in which this translation occurs is 2 Cor. 8: 8, but here the Greek is σπουδη and not προθυμια.

Ghost.—Except in the phrase, "Holy Ghost," this word is now equivalent to goblin. "Ghostly," in the sense of spiritual is still found a dried specimen in religious formularies, but aside from these instances its old meaning of the vital, as opposed to the spiritual part of man has disappeared. Acts 5: 5, "Ananias gave up the ghost. (Wiclif: was deed.) Milton uses the word only its goblin sense.

> Some say no evil thing that walks by night,
> In fog, or fire, by lake, or moorish fen,
> Blue meagre hag, or stubborn unlaid *ghost*
> That breaks his magic chains, at Curfeu time,
> No goblin or swart facry of the mine,
> Hath hurtful power o'er true virginity.
>
> Comus, 434.

Grief.—This word and its derivatives stood, in King James' time, much nearer its Latin root, *gravis*, than it now

does. The idea of weight had not yet fallen by the way, and there was much picturesqueness in its use in the following passages. Is. 53: 4, "He hath *borne* our *griefs*." Job 6: 2, 3, "O! that my *grief* were thoroughly weighed; and my calamity laid in the balances together, for now it would be *heavier* than the sand of the sea." 2 Cor. 2: 5. The translators generally have dropped the figure in this passage, but the Rheimish versionists retain it much to their advantage, "That I *burden* not all you."

## ARTICLE V.

### EXPOSITION OF MATT. XIX: 24.

*"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."*

THIS passage is also given by the Evangelists, Mark and Luke, and there can be no difference of opinion as to its design. The meaning of the Saviour is obvious. He intended to teach, that it is hard, not impossible, but extremely difficult, for a rich man to attain heaven, because he finds it so hard to substitute for his worldly possessions Christ's will. He has so many difficulties to encounter, so many obstacles to impede his progress, that it requires the greatest effort to remove his idols and overcome the world. All rich men will not necessarily be excluded from heaven. An individual will not be condemned, because he is rich. He may be in the possession of great wealth and yet be very pious, very devoted, in the service of his Master. We cannot doubt that many such will be saved. They, however, do not abuse their trust or employ their worldly treasure in self-gratification personal aggrandizement, or suffer it so to engross their attention as to interfere with their love to God. It is not regarded as their chief good, but subordinate to more important interests. The kingdom of God and his righteousness rise higher in their estimation than all other considerations. They consecrate their wealth, as well their hearts, to the great object and mission of life, enjoined by the Scriptural standard. The language employed has, of course, no reference to the sufficiency of God's grace, which is always ade-

quate under every circumstance and in every condition of life, because it is infinite, but only to the impediments with which the individual is obliged to contend, the conflicts, through which he must pass and which nothing but divine grace can successfully overcome.

1. Although the design of the passage seems very intelligible, different opinions have been maintained with regard to the illustration employed. The most common is the literal interpretation of the word, indicating the extreme difficulty of the act. It is said no better representation of an exceedingly difficult thing could be presented than the effort to pass a camel, one of the largest and clumsiest quadrupeds, through the eye of a needle, which is one of the smallest orifices. In confirmation of this view, it is asserted, that among some of the oriental nations, at the present day, there are proverbial expressions of a similar character. When they wish to speak of an enterprise, that it is exceedingly difficult or an effort that is apparently impossible, so far as human ability is concerned, they say that a camel or an elephant might as readily walk through the eye of a needle.

2. Other critics, both ancient and modern, in order to relieve the difficulty of this interpretation, in consequence of the supposed extravagance of the figure, propose the substitution of the Greek word καμιλον or the use of κημηλον in the sense of *cable* or *rope*, which, although it cannot go through the eye of a needle they say has a greater affinity to it and would, therefore, be more naturally used in connexion with it. A rich man, in comparison with a poor one, is as a cable compared with a single thread, stronger but not so pliable, the parts of which must be untwisted and separated before it can pass through the eye of a needle. In this way the indivdual must be loosed from his riches and then the hope may be indulged, that he can, thread by thread, go through the eye of a needle; otherwise he will fail in his object and never reach heaven. However plausible the explanation may appear, there is no reliable manuscript authority for a change in the text to κάμιλον, and the *usus loquendi* will not justify our taking κημηλον in this sense.

3. There is a third interpretation suggested, not generally adopted, which we regard as more natural and satisfactory. It is the reference of the comparison to a wicket gate or door. The cities of the East are surrounded by high and massive walls. At certain points, these walls have passages

for the egress and ingress of the inhabitants. In times of peace these were opened during the day, but closed at night. By the side of these large entrances were those that were much smaller, designed for foot passengers and by those who had occasion to go in and out at night. They were known by the name of the needle's eye, through which a camel can not pass, unless relieved of his immense burden, and then with much difficulty. It was necessary for the animal to go with his load through the broad gate. As an illustration Lord Nugent, in his work entitled "Lands, Sacred and Classical," represents himself as being about to walk out of Hebron through the large gate, when his companions, seeing a train of camels approaching, desired him to go through the eye of the needle or the small side of the gate. The incident immediately suggested to the traveller the language of the Saviour and furnished a satisfactory explanation to his mind. He adds "the sumpter would not pass through, unless with great difficulty and stripped of his load, his trappings and his merchandise." The Persians have a proverb, that a needle's eye is wide enough for two friends—the whole world is too narrow for two foes. The Jews, too, use similar language to express an impossibility. Literally, then, it means that it is easier for a huge camel with all his load of goods to go through this small side gate, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, of course, one who loves his riches and places confidence in them, who is not willing to be released from the burthen, which operates as an obstruction to his passage. Now it is not impossible for a rich man to enter heaven. Many there are, who consecrate their wealth to the service of Christ and repose in Him alone for salvation. But just as the camel must be relieved of its load, before it can pass through the needle's eye; so the rich man must lay aside the riches of the world, "every weight and the sin which doth most easily beset him, looking to Jesus as the author and finisher of his faith," and devote all his interests to the service and glory of God. It is impossible to serve God and the world. "It is easier for the camel to go through the eye of a needle." "How hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!"

# ARTICLE VI.

## THESES UPON THE CHURCH,

*With particular reference to the determination of them, by our Symbolical Books. By Dr. Theodore Harnack, Professor at Erlangen.*

Translated by Rev. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M. Professor in Pennsylvania College.

[*Concluded from page* 134.]

### D. Mission of the Church.

41. The real or unchangeable Church, as we have defined it above, sustains a double relation, (see Pts. 13, 14, 15,) *a vital relation to Christ*, and *a missionary relation to the world.* The former is the *primary*, *conditioning*, upon it depends the nature, the continuance, and the positive vital power of the Church, from this she receives the character of a *community of grace* in the world. The other is the *derived*, *conditional*, assuming its normal form absolutely through the former, and gives it the character of an *Institution of grace* for the world.

42. It is true, the one must not be separated from the other; the church receives both from Christ, through him she is both at the same time, *a congregation* and *an institution* of salvation; yet the designated causal connection must be observed, and by no means be reversed.

43. For only from the fact, that Christ creates a *congregation*, which is so united to him, as to receive from him its *principle of life*, and in which he gives *form* and *place*, to his continued activity on the earth, is she authorized and qualified, also to serve him, as the appropriate *organ* of this his activity (see Pts. 13, 21,) i. e., the church is *witness* and *instrument*, only because creation and *body* of Christ, who as head gives her vitality.

44. As such she is entirely a ministering organ, therefore neither *subject* and *source*, nor *measure* and *limit* of saving grace. *This is alone in Christ*, he himself treats with men, in the administered means of grace, and he continues also, as head of the Church, the constantly superintending, inde-

pendent and free Lord of grace with reference to her. Therefore all mediation of the Church is to be rejected, in which, instead of remaining a servant of Christ, she sets herself up as his substitute.

The truth of the proposition: extra ecclesiam nulla salus, extends therefore only so far as the sphere of operation of the Church on earth extends. Applied beyond this, she usurps a mission with which she has not been intrusted, and lays hands upon the royal prerogative of Christ, which he has not resigned to her. The sphere of her operation is the world upon earth, "the field is the world," beyond this she has no commission and no means to labor.

45. The mission of the Church is immediately connected with her *position as an economy of salvation*, as intermediate period in the New Testament Kingdom of God, (Pts. 5, 6,) and with her position *in the world* and *for the world.* She is therefore subject to the *earthly law of development*; she is to gather successively for herself from the world and thus uphold and develope, as well as maintain and complete herself progressively by *testimony* and *conflict* until her object shall be attained (Eph. 4: 13, sq.)

Both mutually depend upon each other, the Church builds herself up *externally* and *internally*, as a *whole* and in the case of *individuals*, whilst she maintains herself to be that, which she is and has; and again such an execution of her mission must aid her in becoming in a greater degree, what she is, and in receiving what she needs, to attain finally what she should and shall become. Her mission therefore has its source, power and design in her nature, and her nature attains finally its completion, by a universal realization of her mission. See the larger Catechism p. 457, 51, sq.

We speak here of the mission of the Church in general, without making a distinction between her mission in the restricted sense and the Christian call. See Pts. 59, 60.

46. From her *position as an economy of salvation*, as well as her mission in the world, there follows for the nature of the Church, that she is during her existence upon earth necessarily a *true* and *actual* congregation of Christ, and yet at the same time, one which is still *increasing* and *progressing*, in degree as well as extent. This is so little excluded, that progress on the other hand is itself an element of the

truth of the kingdom of Christ in the form of the Church; as conversely it is only granted to the Church, to grow, *because she has*, and as far as she holds *firmly and faithfully*, what she has.

47. What however holds of the Church in the gross and the whole of her successive development (Pt. 45,) holds also of each separate position of her simultaneous existence. She shows herself progressing in degree and extent in it in this way, that she at the same time completes in herself, not only all stages and conditions which are possible and granted within her vital relation, (of believers in Christ) but also embraces the different positions, which are found within her missionary relation, and in which the obedient or disobedient subjects of her call are still found this side of faith.

48. She is able to embrace all these, without having her essential character thereby destroyed; yet with the supposition and condition, that she herself thereby maintain and realize firmly and faithfully the elevation, certainty and perfection of her faith and knowledge, which she has historically attained. On the other hand, she incurs blame, when the causal connection existing between her nature and mission is reversed (Pt. 42,) and she herself is helplessly tossed about, and under the most favorable circumstances is incessantly thrown back upon an earlier stage.

49. In general the Church dare not, because her vital relation (to Christ) is that which assigns the measure, and fixes the end and limits to her missionary relation, so understand and fulfil her commission, as to cease to be a congregation of the Lord, and to suffer injury in the former relation, in the degree in which she appears to gain in the latter. But she ought not to fear that she cannot be or remain any longer the true congregation of the Lord, *because* her missionary relation brings this to pass that, viewed in this aspect, there is found a mixture of active and passive, genuine and counterfeit members; and *so long* as it remains possible for her, to maintain in its integrity her fundamental relation, as the only and absolute normal one. The Church *ought* to endure this state, unless she wishes to forget, why she is in the world, and for what purpose the latter is to serve her, and she *is able* to bear it, because she herself though the true, is not yet the completed, but progressive realization of the gracious kingdom of Christ.

An external separation and union of supposed believers and saints is just as much opposed to the will

of the Lord, the authority and the mission of the Church, as such a confounding of the Church and the world, where the spirit of the latter, quietly gains the mastery, or in the way designated, as the will of the undistinguished crowd, sets itself up as the norm in the Church.

E. Mode of Existence of the Church.

50. It is connected with the mission of the Church, to make a distinction, during her whole earthly career, between the cœtus credentium and the cœtus vocatorum, or between the *real or unchangeable* and the *empirical* Church, whilst it is impossible and unnecessary to draw externally the line of separation between them. This distinction, in accordance with the scriptures and our confessional writings, is a necessary constituent in the Protestant idea of the Church, follows consistently from the material principle of our Church, and is a faithful expression of the actual condition of the whole Church from the days of the apostles to the present time.

Thus already the Augustana in Art. VII and VIII distinguishes (real Church or ecclesia *proprie* sic dicta and empirical Church, hypocritæ et mali admixti,) and also the Apology: ecclesia *proprie* and *large* sic dicta p. 153, 156, 157; *malos nomine* tantum in ecclesia esse, non re, bonos vero *re* et *nomine* p. 153; *vivum corpus Christi* quæ est *nomine* et *re* ecclesia p. 155, and societas or *politia externa* p. 152 sq. in the German text, *proper*, *right* Church, the *body* of Christ, the *bride* of Christ and the *great multitude*, which is called the Church, the *external society or State*, (id.;) or, "*what the Church is*," and "*how she appears in this world*" p. 154, 155.

The disregard and neglect of this distinction injures the foundations of Protestantism, produces indifference with reference to the real Church and misleads to an over-estimate of the empirical.

51. As the Lord has willed and determined, that the Church should be built by means of the Church, he has not only ordained the opposition of Church and world, but also of *Church* and *Church*, in this aspect of the subject, that she contains within herself, during her progressive completion on earth, not only the contrasts of weak and strong,

undecided and decided, diseased and healthy faith, but carries also with herself *the contrast of believers* and of such who having been called make a profession of without however being embraced vitally in her faith, she is therefore at the same time to edify herself in such a way, that the one party be increased in number and strength in what they are, the others become that to which they have been called, and for which by virtue of the divine gracious act of baptism, they have been designed and fitted, but which they are not yet in reality. Pt. 47.

> Viewed in relation to the Church, the whole human race divides itself into such, as are *designed* for; those called to and incorporated with the Church; and those who have entered into the Church themselves in such a way, that they aid in forming it. Between the first and second, the word and baptism on the one side, and the profession of Christian faith on the other form the definite boundary; between the second and the third faith draws the line, on which account, in spite of the possibility of recognizing faith relatively, it cannot be drawn by men. That the Church cannot do this, should be indeed an additional reason for enduring this contrariety, but may not be made a reason, to measure and determine thereby her nature.

52. For as surely as those who have been called by baptism and the word, are placed by the act of Christ in a new relation to God, just as certainly are they only *passive* members, objects and not subjects of the Church, so long as that relation has not been able to effect in them a corresponding *self-maintenance in faith.* They do not yet constitute the Church, but only belong to her; they do not show what the Church is but only how far her missionary field extends; they likewise do not yet aid in maintaining the Church, but are maintained by her. Therefore it can only be said of them, that they are members of the Church in its visible progress, believers only are members of the really progressing Church.

53. The contrast now spoken of constitutes the *servile condition of the Church in this present world.* For it asserts nothing else, than that in the present stage of her existence her nature and appearance do not coincide, that she has yet *a mode of existence, not homogeneous with her nature.* Still this does not establish the existence of two Churches for,

1) the *real* or *genuine* Church exists always in the empirical and the latter only in the former, 2) we must believe, in consequence of the divine promise, in the existence of the *first* where the latter is and 3) *everythiug* which we have said of the nature and mission of the first, holds also *of the last*, yet only so far and to such an extent as the former actually manifests itself in the latter.

54. Thus the Church lives, as a real one, in the condition of her humiliation "is concealed under the cross" (Apol. p. 155.) But as her Lord has been exalted, so there remains for her a *state of exaltation.* Thus far the *history of her life* has been a history of incessant struggles and suffering, but the history of her suffering is also the *history of her formation.* Still she does not die, she is not only victorious for the first time at the close, but in every moment of her existence, yes this very thing, that she still exists and remains in the midst of the world, opposing her both within and without her pale, is already her triumph, and shows that she has a Lord as her head, who is greater than the world. See Form. Conc. p. 715, 50.

The parallel between Christ and his Church, which is more than a parallel, has been already drawn in the Apology p. 155.

55. That contrast (Pts. 51, 23,) has actually existed since the origin of the Church; it has not been made by dogmatic theology, and cannot and dare not be taken away from her, by efforts after a supposed more reliable idea of unity. It must not allow itself to be offended by the servile condition of the Church, and not endeavor to remove the contrast connected with it; its mission is much more to establish it and to show its truth and necessity, in connection with the economy of salvation.

In the same proportion in which, individuals, in their efforts to solve the problem, place themselves either altogether on the side of the empirical Church, or the real or true Church, depriving them of their earthly reality, designate them as absolutely invisible, they repeat the Ebionitic or Docetic error in the dogma of the Church. If objection be made, that in any other way the Church is threatened with dissolution in the hands of any one, we should not forget, that it is actually so ("as dying and beheld we live") and

that such an idea of unity would be the least able to prevent its dissolution.

56. The customary designation: ecclesia visibilis and invisibilis, applied to the above representation of the mode of the Church's existence is quite false and must lead to error (Pt. 30, Remark.) For the real Church, as the 7th Art. of the Augustana describes it, is not merely invisible; aud the empirical is neither merely the simply visible (Pt. 27,) in as much as it embraces also all the evolved forms of Churchly life (traditiones humanæ Aug. Conf. VII, 2,) nor is she altogether visible, as she has also an invisible side, whether it be faith, hypocrisy, superstition, heterodoxy or unbelief.

## F. The Offices of the Church.

### *a. Thesis.*

57. It accords, with the nature and mission of the Church (Pts. 23, 45,) especially with the position she occupies within the economy of salvation, as a whole, that she neither has nor is acquainted with an office in the Old Testament sense, neither as the result of her nature, design or form, and yet that an *official service* (διακονία, *ministerium*) is necessary and has been divinely instituted for her, which continues as long as the means of grace continue, from which she at present lives. 2 Cor. 3: 6, sq.; 5: 18, sq.

It is not sufficient to prove a difference. with reference to this point, between the Old and the New Testament, that the former had divinely instituted offices, the latter however not, but *what kind* of offices and *how* and *for what* each had them. On the other hand, the kingdom of God in its future completion will of course have no offices, because she will have no means of grace. To maintain that the New Testament has similar offices with the Old Testament, is a return to the alphabet; to deny that it has in general divinely instituted offices is an anticipation of the future equally destructive to the Church.

58. Indeed the Church, as real or genuine is an organ of Christ (Pt. 43) and as such both *subject* and *object* of her own edification in the Lord, so that every believing Christian, by virtue of this mission common to all, is designed for this object by Christ, to edify himself and the brethren, and to

be an active participant, as far as he is concerned, in the edification of the entire body (Eph. 4: 15, 16.) For they are all priests unto God through Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 2.

59. This they are and can effect however, *on the one hand*, not as a homogeneous mass, but only as *members* of the body of the congregation of Christ, and again not as members, of whom some differ specifically from others, but as those who in relation to the head are mutually *coördinate* and mutually require and supplement each other, as each has received from the head definite *gifts of grace*, the one these, the other those, for his own edification and for the good of the whole, (Eph. 4: 7, 16; 1 Cor. 12.)

60. *On the other hand*, they are and can effect this, not without continuing steadfast in faith in the head, therefore also not without the use and the receiving of the *means of grace*, which are not intrusted to the individual as such, but to the Church in her totality, and for the administration of which, the Lord has granted the specially requisite and appropriate gifts and powers for this purpose, inasmuch "as he has placed some as apostles, some as prophets and evangelists, some as pastors and teachers," by whose service the Church fulfils this commission, which as a whole she has to perform for her members, in order that they may be and become prepared for the completion of each separate call for the edification of the whole body, (Eph. 4: 11, 12.)

61. The organism is therefore, as no other, a living one consisting of conscious members, of whom each one lives in and with the whole, and the whole in each (in his office.) Its continuance and prosperity is connected with the activity and mutual aid of all, but not of all in the same way. But as there is in general a diversity of calls, so there must certainly be a distinction made between the *Christian call* of the individual members, and the mission or call which the Church has received for them, as each individual needs the whole body, and this latter each individual member. This mission of the Church is however comprehended in the potestas clavium, i. e., in the *authority and power* given to her in *the name of Christ and for her own sake, to administer the means of grace;* it is her *official service* with the word and sacraments.

62. This office is not a, but *the gift* of the Lord to his Church, therefore indeed the *common property* of the Church, but because such, even on this account not an individual posses-

sion or an individual mission, which the individual might be authorized according to his pleasure to appropriate to himself, and administer in an arbitrary manner. The individual has only a share in this right, not on accouat of his personal Christian independence and gifts, but on account of his *union as a member* with the head and the whole body; he can therefore also not exercise a right in the former, but only in the latter capacity, consequently only by *virtue of the Church* and commissioned by her i. e., always only *organically*, which right is not his, but belongs to the Church, though in the exercise of it he is obliged to enter upon it with his Christian personality and gifts.

63. The distinction above made between the *Christian call in general* and the particular *official service of the Church*, is found in the nature of the organism, particularly in the nature of the Church as being and progressive in her relation to the head, and finally in the different significance which the members with their gifts have for her vital process, upon the continued activity of which the maintenance and the growth of the whole and the particular parts depend. (1 Cor. 12: 4, sq.; 27, sq.)

64. This distinction has its foundation, neither in a diversified communication of the Spirit, nor is it to be confounded with the contrast of office and congregation in the constituted Church, it is in general *no specific*, but an *organic* one and rests upon the inherent contrast, for the Church in her present stage of being, of *the body* as a whole and its *individual members*, both of which however so supplement each other, that the Church as a whole only maintains itself and prospers, whilst each individual member is active in his place with his gift; and that again each member is able only to fulfil his mission and to continue in communion as a member of the whole body, whilst the Church executes her mission with fidelity to the directions of the Lord.

65. This distinction also does not destroy the unity of the Church. She has this on the contrary as a basis, as a guide and as an end; there remains one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body, one spirit and one hope of our calling. It can only be questioned, when it is denied that the Church radically is an *organism*, when it is not granted, that it exists not only in its individual members, but at the same time is an *objective* power, independent indeed of individuals, but divinely instituted for their advantage, which "begets

and supports" the individual members "through the word of God," (Pt. 10,) and when the appointed significance of the means of grace for faith is not kept in view.

The office keeps up in the Christian world the idea of the objectivity of the Church, so necessary and so consolatory to faith, and also that of the authority alone belonging and actually given to her by divine authority, for the administration of the grace of God. This is the value and the significance of it for the Christian condition and call, as conversely this is the conditio sine qua non for the proper and successful conduct of the office.

66. For the sake of determining more accurately *what the office is*, and whence it *originates*, it will also be necessary to make a distinction first of all, as we have already done in determining the idea of the Church, between the office in its definite nature as one and constantly like to itself, and its diversified and changing *empirical form*, that is between *office* and *state of the office*. In the former aspect, it belongs to the real Church and is juris divini, in the latter to the empirical and is juris humani. We are of course here concerned altogether about the office in its real nature.

67. But here the *internal authority*, and the *origin of the official power*, which indeed is usually overlooked, distinguish themselves from *the qualifying* and *the authorizing* of individuals to administer the office, and these must be first considered.

68. In accordance with this, the office springs from the *office of Christ* and *his Spirit* (is "an office by means of which the Holy Ghost works" Apol. p. 261; Concord form. p. 602,) rests upon the gracious presence of Christ in his Church, exerting mediatorial agency through the means of grace, and consists in the *right* and *power* (jus et potestas) granted to her by Christ, *to administer organically the means of grace in his name.*

Matt. 28: 18, sq., the Lord confirms his commission (v. 19) with the assertion of his power (v. 18) and the promise of his presence until the end of the world (v. 20.) The commission has not been given to the apostles alone, does not expire with them, but only with the present order of things, and institutes the office therefore as one to continue until that time.

Our Symbolical books identify the office justly with

the potestas clavium and define it as ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta (p. 39, 156, 288,) or as potestas seu mandatum Dei praedicandi evangelii, remittendi et retinendi peccata et administrandi sacramenta p. 63, 334, etc.

69. The office has been divinely instituted as a beneficium seu gratia, non judicium seu lex (Apol. p. 185;) it has been established by Christ just as the Church, and called into existence and put into operation in and at the same time with it. It is his institution, for 1) he has instituted the things to be administered, the *means of grace*, 2) he has given her the *command* to administer them, 3) he has *promised* that his Church shall never be without the gifts to qualify her for the execution of his command, and 4) by the calling of his *apostles* he has given to the Church the original *direction* to intrust continually suitable persons with the administration of the office.

Ad 1) Conf. Aug. V. "God has instituted the office of the ministry, given the gospel and sacraments, through which as means, he gives the Holy Ghost." The *Apology* insists so stricte upon maintaining the divine institution of the office, that it even ventures to call it a sacrament, because the ministerium verbi (as these) habet *mandatum* Dei et habet magnificas *promissiones* (p. 203.)

Ad 2) The symbolical books refer absolutely and properly the commissions and promises given to the Apostles by the Lord, to the office of the Church in in general. See p. 63, 333, sq.

Ad 3) The office of the ministry, is in the place where God communicates his gifts, Art. Smalc. Commencement p. 333, 341.

Ad 4) In the apostolic office, two aspects must be distinguished, the one is connected with the persons of the apostles and by virtue thereof, they were during their lifetime and have continued to be by the writings they have left behind, the founders and pillars of the Church of all times, and the normal canonical authority for the administration of all offices in the Church; according to the other, they were the first disciples of the permanent churchly office, whose continuance is not terminated by their death, because the Lord, his commission and his Church have contin-

ued. "The office of the ministry," the Smalcald Articles say, "proceeds from the general call of the apostles."

70. The office of the New Testament is not limited, as was that of the Old Testament, either to an *institution based upon a fixed order*, or to a *definite form of investiture* or still less to a *particular class of persons* 1), but it has been given to the *Church* in its totality, i. e., to the spiritual body of Christ 2), and indeed as an inherent *right* to intrust those qualified, with such authority in the name of God 3), and also as a *duty* imposed upon her, to see to it, that constantly persons should be authorized to perform this service 4), and to be careful that they discharge the duties of this office according to the will of the Lord, and the norm of the apostles 5.)

1) "Ministerium novi testamenti non est alligatum locis et personis, sicut ministerium leviticum, sed est dispersum per totum orbem terrarum et ibi est, ubi Deus dat dona sua." Art. Smalc p. 333.

2) "Claves sunt officium et potestas ecclesiæ a Christo data * * * * the same p. 321, 341, non tantum certis personis." "Ad haec necesse est, fateri, quod claves non ad personam unius certi hominis, sed ad ecclesiam (the whole Church) pertineant * * * * Christus tribuit principaliter claves ecclesiæ et immediate; sicut et ob eam causam ecclesia principaliter habet jus vocationis" p. 333.

3) "Nam ubicunque est (vera) ecclesia, ibi est jus administrandi evangelii. Quare necesse est ecclesiam retinere jus vocandi; eligendi et ordinandi ministros. Et hoc jus est donum proprie datum ecclesiæ, quod nulla humana auctoritas ecclesiæ eripere potest, Art. 341."

4) "Habet enim ecclesia mandatum de constituendis ministris, quod gratissimum esse nobis debet, quod scimus Deum approbare ministerium illud et adesse in ministerio, Apol. 203."

5) "Paul in 1 Cor. 3, makes all the servants of the Church equal, and teaches that the Church is more than the servants" Art. Smalc. p. 330. "Hic (in the ministration of the word) necessario et de jure divino debent eis (episcopis) ecclesiæ præstare obedientiam. Verum quum aliquid contra evangelium docent aut

statuunt, tunc habent ecclesiæ mandatum Dei, quod obedientiam prohibet." (Conf. Aug. p. 64,) Non est enim mandatum cum libera, ut vocant, sed cautio de rato," (See the German text Apol. p. 289,) see particularly Art. Smalc. 335, 38, sq., (ne ecclesiæ eripiatur facultas judicandi et decernendi ex verbo Dei," p. 339,) and 342, 72.

71. Inasmuch as *Christ* is the only *source* and *origin* as well of the *official authority* itself, as the *spiritual qualifications* necessary for the performance of the duties of the office, and as his Church is the primary and continued *possessor of this authority*, and as such is alone *authorized*, but also *obligated*, to exercise care, for the organic administration of the office, by the examination, choice and authorization of snitable persons, the officers themselves are at the same time *servants of Christ and the Church*, act at the same time in the *name* and by the *authority of both*, Christ and his Church, but not of both in the same way, for though they receive the office *through* men, it is not *from* men, but *from Christ*. Therefore they have also the same commission which the apostles had, but neither in the immediate, and personal, manner as they, nor to serve as a rule for others. Since neither their *personal Christian* nor their *official character*, give security for the truth and efficiency of their conduct, but its *accordance with scripture*.

Ministri funguntur vice Christi; non repræsentant suam personam, juxta illud: qui vos audit, me audit Luke 10: 16; Apol. 162. "Nec valet illud ministerium propter ullius personæ auctoritatem, sed propter verbum a Christo traditum" Art. Smalc. 333.

72. The *official state* i. e., the diversified forms and arrangements for the administration of the office, which have been left to the voluntary determination of the Church, appertains to *Church discipline*, but the office in its reality has reference, as the Church, and in an equal degree with her, to the *regulations for salvation*. For whilst the offices of the New Testament have absolutely nothing more to do with a sacerdotal mediation for salvation, whether it be connected with their persons or their actions—for they are just as little means of grace as the Church—still they are an organic service, by means of which, for the sake of the administered means of grace, the gift and operation of the Spirit and of grace are mediated. Thus far, therefore, because only the *preached* word

and the *administered* means of grace have promises connected with them, it belongs to the ordinances of salvation.

> "Ut *hanc fidem* conseqamur, institutum est ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta," (Conf. Augsb. Art. V.) Ac prodest, quantum fieri potest, ornare ministerium verbi omni genere laudis adversus fanaticos homines, qui somniant spiritum sanctum dari non per verbum, sed propter suas quasdam præparationes, si sedeant otiosi, taciti, in locis obscuris, expectantes illuminationem, quemadmodum ἐνθουσιασταὶ docebant et nunc docent Anabaptistæ, (Apol. p. 203.)

*b. Antithesis.*

73. This evangelical idea of the offices of the Church we defend, with the Apology, in opposition to the *hierarchichal view which makes them legal in their nature*, and the *collegialistic volatilization of them.*

74. The office has not been instituted as a particular *order* in the Church through a special communication of the Spirit in addition to the general one, and is generally neither an *emanation* nor a *continuance* of the special *apostolical office*, with apostolical dignity and authority.

75. For the efficiency of the means of grace is not dependent upon the supposed legitimacy of the incumbents, and their design, but upon the *word*, and the *promise* of Christ and the existence of his Church. 1) And the uninterrupted existence of the Church likewise, is not dependent upon the figment of the successio episcopalis, but solely on this, "continuance in the doctrine of the Apostles."

> 1) Sicut in casu necessitatis absolvit etiam laicus et fit minister ac pastor alterius. Art. Smalc. Addition, p. 341.
>
> Mutuum colloquium et consolatio fratrum, id. p.319.

76. But the office is no less confounded with the condition of it, and its nature mistaken, when applying to it the customary *collegialistic theory of transfer*, we allow it to exist for the sake of *external order*, and derive its origin from the *natural* contrast of giver and receiver, or from the *spiritual* opposition of a different distribution of *gifts*.

77. For *order* does not create the office, but ordains only the administration of it, and so likewise the *gifts* have been given by the Lord not for the creation of the office, but for

the appropriate exercise of that which has been instituted by him. That derivation shows therefore only either how the Church regulates the administration of the office, or how the personal authorization is derived, but nothing however is gained thereby for the origin and idea of the office itself, and we can only speak under such circumstances of a divine origin of it *abusive.*

78. But the Church has an office, not because she has believers or spiritually gifted persons, but because she has the *means of grace* and the commission of the Lord. Both hierarchism and the customary *collegialism* in their way fail to recognize this distinction. Both, though proceeding from points so diametrically opposite, agree however in this, in causing the office to disappear in the person ; for both transfer the centre of gravity into the *personal*, the one in a *hierarchical*, the other in a *charismatic* way.

79. For the same reason also finally, the office cannot be derived from the *universal priesthood* of all Christians, and be designated as an emanation, concentration or organization of it. For :

1) Though the office is comprehended in the universal priesthood, because within the real or genuine Church, still the authority for it does not coincide with the right of Christians; for the former is the right of the Church, the latter of a person, this is therefore absolutely connected with the personal faith of the individual, that on the contrary not with the faith of the incumbent of the office, though indeed the unbelieving administration of it is exceedingly inconsistent and ruinous to the soul.

2) The universal priesthood also is not the causal ground and source of the office, but the personal supposition or Christian qualification is, for the successful administration of the office.

3) Nor does this itself justify the discharge of the official service, nor does the individual believing Christian, in contrast with the instituted office, lose his claim to the exercise of any rights as Christian priest. Nay rather, the office is intended to be an aid in enabling him to make a continually more complete and richer use of them.

4) When therefore an individual Christian casu necessitatis executes, what belongs to the offiee of the Church, he does it with authority, because in the supposed case of necessity, the Church is for the time being absolutely represented in him, but he also acts then by virtue of the office inherent in the Church. Had he acted on the contrary, in such a case, by virtue of the universal priesthood of Christians, as is usually maintained, the efficiency of his words or actions would be made dependent upon his faith; for only believers have the right of Christian priesthood.

5) Finally history confirms our proposition, whilst it shows, how indifference with reference to the significance of the office, or the depreciation of it goes hand in hand, not it may be with indifference towards the universal priesthood, but (as e. g. the authorities sufficiently testify) much more with an undue exaltation of the latter, and at the same time with the neglect of the means of grace.

## G. The Organized Church or Christianity.

80. By Christianity we mean the Church as she at any time exists in her *empirical form and appearance* i. e., the sum total of those *Forms* in which she administers the means of grace in worship, or in life, whether it be in her instructions, liturgies or schools, and of those *regulations*, by which she organizes herself, and by means of which she regulates, conducts and defends her vital agencies—consequently every thing which includes in itself the so-called official *Church-regulations* and *laws*.

81. The Church *is able* thus to organize and constitute herself, without thereby suffering any injury in her internal nature and truth, partly because she is an internal *organism*, which has been founded and destined for an articulated organization, with its abundance of powers, gifts and trusts, partly because she is in accordance with her nature, not *merely invisible* (Pt. 25); she *must* do it also, as well for her own edification, as for the sake of her condition and mission in the world; but she is *allowed* to do this only in such a way as to make no change in her nature.

82. Hence it follows, that her organization, as far as the *that* and the *how* of it is concerned, 1) is not an *arbitrary*

and accidental, but a *necessary* one, and indeed such a one, as is conscious of being bound to the real Church, as to her norm and soul, inasmuch as this latter is intended to be made manifest and to receive form in it, and without which the empirical Church could not exist at all; and 2) that this organization, so far as it is the voluntary work of the Church, always exists solely jure humano, that consequently the Church can never transfer the centre of gravity of her existence into it, without being untrue to herself.

83. We oppose therefore on the one side that collegialistic view, which considers Church regulations, because of human origin, as arbitrary, and desires them on this account to be subject to the pleasure of the multitude and the daily changes of opinion; on the other side the *hierarchical*, which claims for all the institutions and regulations a *sacramental* character, and puts these down as necessary to salvation, because it traces them back to supposed divine and apostolic directions or ascribes to the Church prescribing them as such, an apostolical authority. See Conf. Aug. Art XV, etc.

84. Much more in the matter of Church regulations must there be a distinction made between A) The *admitted* and *permanent* and B) those *voluntarily established*, and eventually *changing*. The former is that which was positively established along with the nature and mission of the Church; the latter that which has been given over to her formative and regulating motive and generating power, subject to the change of external Churchly relations.

85. A. As far as the first is concerned, there grow out for the Church a) from her *vital relation* (to Christ) and b) *her missionary character* (with reference to the world,) certain permanent norms and guides for her order; but from both with different significance and force for her, as indeed both are not in co-ordinate relation to each other. (Pt. 41.)

86. a. By virtue of her relation to Christ, the method of attaining, together with the *means of salvation*, are native with the Church, and the *Scriptural* maintenance and administration of these constitute the substance and the design of all her different activities. From this point of view therefore she is obliged to give the permanent rules and unchangeable principles for the organization of these agencies, and dare not dissent from them, if she does not as empirical desire to break loose from herself as the real Church and from Christ, and thus destroy herself as a Church.

It is not left to the pleasure of the Church, *whether* and *what* she shall preach, *whether* and *how* she shall administer the sacraments in a salutary way, but she does this by the command of the Lord and is allowed therefore to do it only *according* to his will.

87. The order of salvation is not however by any means to be separated from the revelation of salvation, as history and doctrine, therefore the establishment of a scriptural form of doctrine, (it matters not whether one already defined in settled formulas or not, and whether one orally transmitted, or already fixed in writing), is the chief design of the Church in her process of organization. For in her standards of doctrine the Church utters *what* and *how she believes and confesses in accordance with the scriptures*, and again as she believes and confesses, so she preaches and catechises, thus she holds her public services, and exercises her pastoral and disciplinary duties, and thus establishes her constitution.

Thus Act. 2 : 42. "Continuance in the doctrine of the apostles," is placed first by the Church in her earliest organization, (see also Rom. 6 : 17 ; Tim. 6 : 3 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 3; Titus 2 : 1,) and so also our Symbolical books place first the pura et certa doctrina, the consentire de doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramentorum.

88. In consequence of this position, which the *confession*, (as expression of the belief and pillar of the correct form of doctrine) occupies backwards with reference to the word of God and faith, and forwards to all the activities of the Church, the organized Church is as certainly Church of the Confession, and will continue to be this so long, and wish to see the basis of her external continuance therein, as she is and will remain Church of the faith i. e., not neglect nor relinquish the internal vital connection with that which she really is, and for the sake of which she principally exists. Her *unity* i. e., her existence, because internally conditioned by the unity of her belief, is externally determined by the unity of her confession, and only under this supposition is she able not only to bear the greatest diversity in the form of her activities (Preaching, Worship, Discipline, Constitution,) without suffering anything in her nature, but also to allow this to regulate itself freely, for the purpose of unfolding continually in a more diversified way the fullness of her nature.

"Et haec ecclesia proprie est *columna veritatis*, retinet enim purum evangelium," etc., (Apol. p. 155.) See also Art. Smalc. Apol. p. 133, 25.

"Ad veram unitatem ecclesiæ satis est consentire de doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramentorum nec necesse est etc," Conf. Aug. Art. VII. Nos de vera, hoc est spirituali unitate loquimur, sine qua non potest existere fides in corde seu justitia cordis coram Deo. Apol. p. 158, v. also Form. Concord. p. 553, 703.

89. b. In her missionary relation to the world, the Church meets with the order established at the time of, and subsequent to the creation; with the permanent laws of the world, and the forms which have become *historical* in the different natural relations. These indeed she is to sanctify, to fill with her spirit, and to use in accordance with it, whilst she takes them into her service, but she is not allowed to treat them with contempt, nor violate them, arbitrarily; she is obliged much more to respect them in so far as she feels herself obligated, in the forms of their activities and regulations, to give the appropriate value to those social or ethical, psychological, logical or æsthetical rules, rights and laws. v. Aug. Conf. Art. XII, Apol. p. 215, sq.

90, Thus the Church has to complete her organization, according to the normal laws of salvation and with the observance of the laws of nature. From both she receives fixed fundamental principles of course necessary and also necessary to salvation, which remain similar to each other at all times and under all circumstances, and which she dare not surrender, without doing violence to her nature or her mission. When however conflicts arise, (which can only at any time occur through man,) then she would be obliged to cease to be what she is, if she were willing to allow the order of nature to be a measure or rule for the order of salvation, and sacrifice the latter to the improper use of the former.

91. B. Under the designated conditions, rules and regulations, the *further formation*, arrangement and relative establishment of the forms of Churchly action, life, etc., do not take place without the voluntary agency of men. As this in general is dependent upon the progress of the Church in the world and in history, and therefore upon national, temporal, local influences, etc., so is it subject to the free judgment of the Church, and to development and change. The

thus resulting "traditiones humanæ" have only then a right to lay in a claim to be regarded, when they show themselves to be in harmony with the above designated rules and principles of Churchly self-organization, and dare not in general in themselves be considered as necessarily applicable to secure salvation.

> Ad veram unitatem, dicimus, non esse necessariam similitudinem rituum humanorum, sive universalium sive particularium, quia justitia fidei non est justitia alligata certis traditionibus. (Apol. p. 158.)
>
> Docent, quod ritus illi servandi sint, qui *sine peccato* servari possunt et prosunt ad tranquillitatem et bonum ordinem in ecclesia. * * * De talibus rebus tamen admonentur homines, ne conscientiae onerentur, tanquam talis cultus ad salutem necessarius sit. (Conf. Aug. XV.)

92. From the relation of the Church to her historical progress, there results for her this work *first of all*, that she do not give place to unregulated liberty, which always desires to begin at once. She has much more to defend, for the sake of her history as an inheritance accruing to her, that which has already gained a relatively completed expression, in a way correspondent with the nature of the subject, and should not forget, that the Lord has distributed his gifts to the Church, not only simultaneously but successively different, and that which he has granted to *one age*, he wishes to have given for *all* the latter periods of the Church.

93. Further however she is in opposition to a false history of her progress to hold fast to this, that she herself is progressive, and that all her regulations are just as much capable, as they stand in need of development. For the nature and appearance of the Church, Church and Christianity, coincide absolutely in no one particular. In general therefore the Church of a given present can only then be a living defender of that which has been transmitted, when she by virtue of her liberty and self-independence, at the same time recognizes and shows herself as the framer of it.

94. *Finally* it follows from this, that the Church, because she still lives in the flesh and in sin, i. e., has also about and upon her these things which are in opposition to good order, must give to her collective organization necessarily also a legal appearance, and the form of law, so that every one, who belongs to the Church, may subject himself to this law-

ful order. This is not inconsistent with her freedom, and is itself to be regarded as a consequence of her recognition of the existing divine government of the world, which every where has the power of law. (But see the following Pt. 96 ad 3.)

95. Whilst the Church in accordance with the above, appoints not merely the mode of her vital action, but establishes herself as an earthly community, she forms lawfully organized *local congregations*, the sum total of which is the Church in her empirical form and appearance. This Church, as a lawfully organized aggregate congregation, or as the empirical body of the congregations (societas externa, politia canonica) is evidently *posterior* in its existence to the congregations of which it is composed, whilst the real or the properly so-called Church, is the sensuous-supersensuous *body of Christ*, the *mother* of all the congregations, the *soul* of the empirical aggregate Church and the identical *object of Christian faith*, at all times and in all places.

96. In the great significance, which Christianity has for the earthly existence and continuation of the Church, she however dare never forget, that the former only exists for the sake of the Church really and properly so called, and that she herself is not a legal institution but a foundation of grace. In accordance with this proposition.

1) The Church is bound continually to maintain a liberal position with *reference to her regulations*, for though she has received for them divine names, institutions and guides, she has no divinely established forms, There is no *absolute form* for the mode of instruction, of worship, of discipline or of constitution. She has therefore to decide not so much between regulations necessary to salvation and Church rules, *but in the sphere of Church rules*, she is to distinguish between that which has been given to her, in the order of grace, and that in the way of nature, and in accordance with this, still further, between that which is in her, juris divini, and what exists juris humani. See above Pt. 89 sq.

2) It is the duty of the Church, in those cases and at those times, where and when her truth or her nature is assailed in her established forms and regulations, to maintain them, for as she has and knows no absolute forms, so also no adiaphora. (Form Con. p. 551, sq., et 697, sq.)

3) Finally the Church is to establish and administer her regulations, *not in the spirit* or intent *of worldly dominion.* Here also she must show of what spirit she is, and is permitted to leave no room to doubt, that she is not a politia externarum rerum, sicut aliæ politiæ, but principaliter a societas fidei et Spiritus Sancti. See Apology p. 156, 23, sq.

## H. The Church and Churches.

97. In a *normal* development, the Church would have presented herself, as the apostolic era proves, certainly also in a *diversity of peculiar Church forms*, varying with the difference of gracious gifts and persons, people and times; for her unity is not a dead but a living one. But different confessions would not have given it, for the unity of faith and of confession upon the Holy Scriptures as a foundation, would have formed the common basis of the different individual Churches and the bond firmly and freely enclosing them all.

98. Now however it is not so; the *external* unity is broken because the *internal* is wanting. *Sin*, which has entered into the development, has been guilty of the separation of the Church into Confessions, whilst it has called forth differences, which make deep inroads into her fundamental character; for this belongs to the Church in its reality, to be Church of the confession. It has also prevented persons from subjecting themselves *universally* and in the *same way* to the only guide, the *divine word*; it has operated to disturb, to obstruct and to destroy the gracious gifts granted to the confessions; it has finally allowed to the *natural, historical factors*, a determinative influence upon the faith and life of the Church.

99. Still in spite of this, the internal, *invisible* unity of believers of all confessions subsists, and this also cannot be destroyed, but this is however the *abnormal condition*, that the unity is only an invisible one, and so far as it yet can be recognized, (in the *œcumenical symbols*, which determine the historical difference between Catholic Christianity and heretical sects), is yet not sufficient, and avails just as little to put an end to this separation, as it was in its power to prevent it. For the separating differences on the one hand extend beyond those symbols and have reference to questions of belief, which saw the light first in the later development

of the Church, on the other hand they exert a reflex influence upon these questions, and thus destroy to a greater or less extent the unity granted in them.

100. The confessions are separated, not because they have a different Christianity or each a separate donum, but because they differ in essentials, in πνεῦμα. The reason of the separaration is found in the change of the *fundamental relation* (to Christ,) and consists in a different ethico-religious definiteness of the articles of the Christian faith. This diversity in principle resulted first in a difference in confession, and then in such a diversity of Christianity, as to render a mutual supplementing, or an immediate exchange of gifts and regulations impossible.

101. It is *possible for all the confessions to be in error*, i. e., that no one in the principle and substance of its confession, present to a greater degree the truth and purity of apostolic Christianity and the institutions of the Church, but each only more or less obscured and distorted, on the one side or the other. Even though such a condition of things would threaten in a higher degree the existence of the Church itself, it cannot yet be maintained a priori, that it is impossible. Should it actually be so, then the Church cannot be aided by *any union* of all or some confessions, this would only increase the evil; then the unity could only be restored by a return to the truth i. e., by a *radical reformation* of the Church, based upon the sound and complete principles of apostolical belief and testimony.

102. But the *Lutheran Church* has entertained, from the beginning, the well-grounded consciousness, that the Lord has already granted, by the services of Luther, to the Christian world such a reformation, and that, in her principle (in consequence of the greater precision of its statements in both matter and form,) and in the *substance* of her *confession developed* in accordance with it, she carries in herself the *apostolical truth* clearly and purely, therefore also the true *Catholic bond of unity* for the Church of Christ.

103. This however is not granted to her as to a *separate communion*, neither also as a particular *charisma*, connected with her occidental or special Germanic character—as must be said of the peculiar form of her Church institutions absolutely—but she is indebted for this to her vital connection with the *universal Church*, that which is in her has been given to the whole christian Church, belongs to it, without

being connected with the empirical Lutheran form of it and stands and falls absolutely with Christianity itself, i. e., with the real or the properly so-called Church, which cannot and will not fall.

104. In consequence of the abnormal development, the *anomalous* contrast of *true* and *false* Church has therefore been added to that of the temporary normal one of the real and the empirical—a contrast, which could only arise naturally on the side of the Church in her visible progress and in connection with which this should be said, that the *natural incongruity*, by no means however destructive of truth and unity (Pt. 53,) which exists between the real or properly so-called Church, and the empirical, i. e., therefore also between the word of God and the formal confession of it, has now increased to an *unnatural variance*, and a criminal *inconsistency*, in consequence of which the empirical Church separates herself as far from the real, and this latter from her, as she includes in herself error in her principles and in her confession.

105. But as the real Church has its members (believers) in *all* confessions, as further the *Lutheran* Church itself is in no way the adequate or fully completed appearance of the former, therefore she dare not designate herself as alone *the Church*, nor bluntly refuse to give the name of Church to the other confessions, so long as these still acknowledge the œcumenical symbols. Still she has justly the right to designate herself, as the *Church of the pure, scriptural confession.* And because she is this, because the real Church at present has the true expression of her faith in her confession, (if not the completely perfect both in matter and form) therefore it dare and must be said of her, that she is standing *in the midst of the true and real Church*, whilst conversely it holds of the other confessions, that the real Church is also found in them, and indeed just in proportion to their different relation to scriptural truth or unscriptural error.

106. This is the *position* assigned to the Lutheran Church in the *development of the Kingdom of Christ* on earth. Just as liberally as she is able to conduct herself in respect to her Churchly life (as indeed also from the beginning she has given latitude to different forms in her midst), she *dare yield nothing* of her *faith* and her *confession*, without surrendering her *apostolical* character, and doing violence to her œcumenical mission. She has much more to maintain that position, both against Unionism and Separatism.

107. *Unionism* offends against the apostolical, *Separatism* against the catholic character of the Lutheran Church. The former will not acknowledge the *central position* of her faith and her confession, and denies that she is the Church of the scriptural confession; the latter fails to recognize the *Individuality* of her Churchly life, and sees in her simply and exclusively *the* Church of Christ on earth. The former, in general, *separates* Church and Churchly life, to the injury of the real Church, and unites where the truth still separates; whilst the latter does not distinguish sufficiently, Church and Churchly life, for the benefit of the latter, and separates also where the truth still binds. Both are united in this, that they do not separate the visible Church from the empirical, the former, for the purpose of making the real Church the invisible; the latter, for the purpose of binding it absolutely to a definite empirical form and appearance.

108. It is a matter of essential or vital importance for the Lutheran Church to be a Church of the confession and she is *certain* of this from God's word, to be the Church of the scriptural confession. If the last is not disputed, let them not shun the consequences, which this admission has for the *Union question of the present day;* is it disputed, let them not unite to prevent a better acquaintance with the supposed errors of this Church; should they however, not be willing to do this, because less value is placed, in general, upon the significance of the Confession, (either because favoring a Union without any, or with a voluntary Confession), the Lutheran Church should not be expected to make a surrender of herself, but they should be just enough to acknowledge, that every Union of this kind involves necessarily a *denial of her principle*, and a *consumption of her substance.*

109. In general, the so-called *Union in points of agreement*, i. e., the voluntary confessional, ought to see; 1) that it must and will necessarily become the prey of the confessionless party; for, on the one hand consistency of principle always prevails in history, and on the other, it is radically infected with the inconsistency of forcing a Union on points of disagreement, although it is euphemistically called a Union in points of agreement; and 2) that the Union movements of the present day have little to do with the questions of Confession or Union, but that their object is to establish, in place of the *two* old evangelical Confessions, *a new Church*, based upon new principles taken from modern theology, and that in such a condition of things, the Lutheran Church

must feel herself challenged so much the more to a contest for her existence.

110. But whilst the Lutheran Church, in such a contest, has the sacred duty of *defending that which has been intrusted to her*, and of bearing the most extreme consequences of it, if compelled to it, as an unmerited cross, it is only to be done, by *holding herself always ready for that Union*, which is promised to the Church, and by giving *positive* aid, so far as she is concerned, for its accomplishment. For this object, she is not to create anything new, nor copy anything old, nor, in an eclectic way, gather up that which is foreign; she is only to carry out continually, with *greater fidelity, truthfulness and completeness*, the *inherent principle and substance of her belief*. This very principle of hers is also her security for the eventual Union of all believing Christians, for it directs her, to hold fast to the *truth*, which alone unites, to separate clearly and securely between that which is unchangeable, and that which is local and temporal in the Church, to acknowledge cheerfully what she has to a greater or less extent *in common* with the other Confessions, to study more faithfully and earnestly the *word of God*, and in the stability and activity, subjection and freedom, completeness and extent of evangelical faith, to confess with the whole Church of the past, present and future: **Credo Unam, Sanctam, Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.**

NOTE. In No. 9 for Communism read *Collegialism.*

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE NATURE OF ORDINATION.

BY REV. R. A. FINK, A. M., Lewisburg, Pa.

OUR attention has been specially directed to the subject of Ministerial Ordination, by reading the able articles of Drs. Hay and Reynolds, published in the *Review*. With the views presented by these brethren, on the subject of the *Ministerium*, we certainly can find no fault. The only apparent difficulty in the way, and the only seeming argument that can be offered against abolishing the *Ministerium*, is connect-

ed with the ordination of candidates for the ministry. Hence we have been led to a careful investigation of this important subject. The results of this investigation we wish to present, for the candid consideration, especially of our ministers. If the reader does not find numerous and extended quotations from the Fathers of the first few centuries of the Christian era, and from the worthy Patriarchs of our own Church, let him not be surprised. Nor must he consider it serious offence if the *Symbolical Books* are not once referred to. These contain the opinions of other men and other times, do not seem to decide the question or, to determine either the meaning or nature of ordination. We wish, if possible, from the teachings of enlightened reason and especially from the Scriptures, to reach and present in a clear light both the facts and the *rationale* of this subject. This is necessary, not only on account of its vital connection with the *Ministerium* question, but because many seem to have confused and erroneous notions as to what it is, and what it does.

In general, Ordination is understood to mean the appointing of men to the sacred office of the Gospel ministry. But this simple and intelligible transaction has been clothed with a mystery, that certainly does not by right belong to it; and is supposed by many to forbid investigation, at least by the Laity, because they are not learned in the Christian *cabala*. All know that the Roman Catholic Church makes Ordination one of its seven sacraments. She supposes that it imparts, when properly and regularly administered, an indelible character to its subject; and confers not only authority to minister in holy things, but a power to give virtue and efficacy to all the other sacraments of the Church administered by the ordained functionary. Such a view is not only utterly void of any scriptural foundation, but is liable to flagrant abuses. Instances, innumerable, might be adduced in illustration of this fact. It lies at the bottom of the extraordinary power the Priests exercise over their deluded people. It is true that Protestants, from the time of the Reformation until now, have successfully raised their voice in opposition to the grosser forms of these errors. Civil and religious liberty, and the cause of truth have advanced just in proportion to the degree, that the people have been convinced that the clergy were invested with no such extraordinary powers. But are there not many still, who firmly and persistently believe, that there is some mysterious virtue in ordination, by which *something*, that no one is able to define, is *communicated* to the person ordain-

ed? Who does not know, that this opinion is strangely and widely prevalent among many Protestant Christians at this day? That our Church is free from it we are by no means certain. The high Church tone of some of her writers, and the constitution of her ecclesiastical polity in some respects seem to us to create and foster such a sentiment. Hence, who will dispute the propriety of looking into the subject; and if possible of stripping off its assumed robe of mystery, and setting it forth in its native and scriptural simplicity?

When ordination has been performed in every part, no matter by whom, let us inquire what has been conferred? Is the minister invested with more knowledge, wisdom, or piety, than he possessed before? If he was deficient in common sense, education, or grace, is he not so still? Many a graceless man has been ordained, and been none the graceless for the act. The experience of the whole Church shows that there is no special virtue, no indefinable mysterious charm, in the laying on of hands, to communicate new powers to the understanding, or implant new graces in the soul, any more than to add new charms to the person of the subject. If this could be so where would be the use of slow, tedious, plodding study, or continued self-examination, watchfulness and prayer? If this were so, there would not be the shadow of an excuse for suffering men to come into the ministry, who burlesque preaching by their consummate ignorance aud impudence, and bring reproach upon religion by their lack of zeal and piety. The imposition of hands by the only authorized persons, according to the idea of some, ought at once to prevent all this. But we are told that although no ability of communicating gifts of this sort is possessed by those who have the *power to ordain*, yet ordination certainly is *valid* only when performed in a certain way and by certain men; and that the ministrations of those, thus ordained, have a *validity*, which the ministrations of no others can have. But what do you mean by *valid* and *validity* in this connection? Do you mean that these men are recognized by the *Church* as properly constituted members, and that their ministrations are authorized and proper? If so, we reply, one part of the Church may recognise them, but another part may not. To say nothing in reference to the Papists setting aside all Protestant Ordination as invalid, we know that some Protestants deny the validity of the ordination ministrations of other Protestants. Now no matter who is wrong, all maintain themselves to be right. It is therefore indifferent to us

whether men regard our Ordination as valid or not, if God owns and blesses our ministrations, we have a testimony to their validity far more desirable. And how many who have not been Ordained at all have this testimony! But still we ask, what do you mean by this validity? Do you presume to assert that in the judgment of the Great Head of the Church a certain Ordination is no Ordination at all? If this is meant how is it ascertained? In what chapter and verse in the New Testament is the passage found that settles this point? It is not found in the Gospels, Acts, Epistles and in the Revelation. In the ministrations of ministers in all the denominations of the christian Church, there is no peculiar efficacy attaching to any one that proves its ordination to be more valid than that of the others. In our own Church the ministrations of the Licentiate are often much more abundantly blessed of God than those of the ordained preacher. Yet all of them administer the Sacrament of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But Baptism, as administered by all, in some cases is unproductive of good, whilst in many others it becomes a great blessing; the Lord's Supper as administered by all, is received by some who fail to discern the Lord's body, and by others who receive him by faith, and are nourished and grow up to everlasting life. The preaching of all these is sometimes without effect, and at other times most effectual. Now here the results seem to be the same in all cases. And where these ministrations are effectual, is it not in all cases the result of the blessing of the Great Head of the Church on these acts of his servants? As there are hundreds of flourishing congregations, and thousands of earnest zealous dsiciples, who have been enlightened and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and who are active in promoting the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, and joyfully living every day in the hope of the glory of God, in all these denominations of christians, who can say, that in the judgment of the Great Head of the Church, who thus accepts their services, and crowns their labor with such abundant success, the *orders* of any are invalid, and their ministrations null and void?

That there has been a regular succession of ministers in the Church from the days of the apostles until now, and always will be, there is no doubt. But where is the true line of this succession to be found? Most obviously, in good men, who are qualified to teach, and who have the spirit of Christ, and not merely in those who have been ordained.

And this line of succession has wisely, in the providence of God, been thrown into such intricate windings, that is impossible for man to trace it. There is not now a minister in the world, who can start from the Synod, Presbytery, or Bishops, that ordained him, and go through every age, naming his ecclesiastical progenitors, proving his regular ordination, until he reach an Apostle as the source. God has hidden the line from human view to repress arrogant pretensions, and place all his servants, however aspiring they may be, upon the same level. We ought to be humble, for humility most of all becomes our profession. Let not any of his servants then, even when most successful, and when receiving most numerous seals to their ministry, be lifted up, but remember that when Paul planted, and Apollos watered, it was God who gave the increase. Hence it is obvious that ordination does not mean that *something mysterious* is communicated, and *must* be performed by *certain* persons in a *certain* way.

But you ask, is ordination then an unmeaning and useless ceremony? By no means. That it is a ceremony of great importance, and productive of the most valuable results is shown by its true nature. It is plain that the great Bishop and Head of the Church has seen fit to ordain that, through the instrumentality of the truth, his kingdom on earth is to be promoted, and the grand purposes of his mercy in the world are to be accomplished. But how can the truth be made efficacious, unless it be known and received by those, upon whom it is designed to operate? True, God might possibly have so arranged his designs of mercy, as to communicate his truth immediately to the understandings and hearts of men. But this is not his method, for "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." But "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach, except they be sent?" There can be no controversy about the fact, that God has in all ages made the preaching of the word the most effectual means for the conviction and conversion of sinners, and the edification and advancement in holiness of heart and life, through faith in the word, of his saints on earth. Now as God has so ordered, that the great and saving truths of the Gospel of his Son should be taught to men by men, it certainly was his intention, and it is therefore necessary and proper, that particular persons should in some way be set apart to the office of preaching and teaching. Hence the Apostle explicitly informs us

that God gave, "some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

Neither can there be any question as to the necessity of proper qualifications in those who are to impart moral and religious instruction. There is however a diversity of opinion, as to how much intellectual culture is requisite to the faithful and successful discharge of the functions of the ministerial office. This point we will not now discuss further than to remark that, when our Lord sent out the first preachers, they undoubtedly possessed qualifications perfectly adapted to their employment. They underwent a previous preparatory training. And as all preachers of the Gospel should be "apt to teach," the Church should require, that those who aspire to the sacred office of the ministry, should be put on a course of training, in order that the *Church* may be able to ascertain as far as it is possible, whether they are likely ever to be able rightly to divide the word, and become workmen that need not be ashamed. Especially in view of the fact that their induction into office by ordination does not impart to them any qualities they would otherwise lack. Preparation for the ministry implies, at least, a knowledge and love of the truth, zeal for its propagation, the faculty of communicating ideas with precision and clearness, ability to stop the mouths of gainsayers, and, above, all warm, active, practical piety. But it may be asked, who shall have the supervision of those who are candidates for the gospel ministry, direct their studies, judge of their progress, and ascertain their fitness for the work? We answer, undoubtedly *the Church.* This it most easily and effectually can do, by delegating certain of its officers or members to carry out its wishes on the subject. As the ministry is an office in the Church, and not the Church itself, it is the duty of the Church to see that the office is filled, and its functions discharged, by worthy men. This duty and right Christ has committed to the Church. And as ordination does not make ministers, the Church, but only makes the Church, ministers, it is not proper that the ministry should of necessity be in itself a self-perpetuating order. Therefore while it is proper, for many reasons, that ministers, themselves ordained, should be delegated and authorized by the Church, to ordain those whom the *Church* judges fit, yet it is not by any divine right that they possess this privilege,

to the exclusion of all others in the Church. This will appear when the ordinations, recorded in scripture, are considered. Hence we would abolish the *Ministerium*, and give our lay representatives in Synod a voice, and a vote in refference to the qualifications and fitness of a candidate for ordination. Let ordained ministers perform the *act* of ordination; not because there is some secret virtue, some peculiar sacredness, or some extraordinary character, communicated *from the hands imposed to the head of the candidate;* not because anything is transmitted in the way of ecclesiastical propagation; but because men, who have been taught, and have enjoyed the benefit of experience, are the most suitable persons that can be employed by the Church in a matter of so much importance.

But how shall Ordination be performed? Among the primitive Christians it was performed by the laying on of hands. This is still the mode almost universally adopted in the christian Church. Without insisting upon any *particular* form as *absolutely* essential, in this simple act of appointing to an office, it is proper to observe the mode practiced by the Apostles. But here we must be careful to guard against mistaken views. The Apostles had power to impart miraculous gifts, and extraordinary powers by the laying on of hands. But who will contend that this is so, in any degree, with ordinary ministers of the Gospel? In this respect the Apostles had no successors. The idea must be repudiated that there is any mystery in ordinary ministerial Ordination. The laying on of hands is a public and solemn recognition and declaration by those who perform the ceremony, that the *Church* has subjected the candidate to such a course of training and examination, as to enable her to decide that he is qualified to become a teacher in the school of Jesus Christ, and that she is willing to recognize him as such. The candidate by the vows he assumes takes the oath of office. Prayer is offered, and the candidate is commended to the guidance and blessing of heaven, in the hope and faith, that He who hears and answers prayer will grant to the young preacher the influence of his good spirit. The individual is thus inducted into an office, instituted in the Church by Jesus Christ himself; he is authorized to preach the word, administer the ordinances of the Church, and do all things that are proper in a minster of the gospel. Where is the mystery in all this? Nothing surely has taken place but a simple investiture. The man is in no-wise changed; he has not been raised to a new

order; he has only been placed in a new relation, and inducted into a new office, with the express injunction not "to lord it over God's heritage." It is parallel to investing an individual with a civil office. Every one understands this. For example a man is elected, or the majority of the voters decide that he is fit, and by them authorized to be President of the United States. How is he to be invested with the office? The fourth day of March arrives, and the ceremony of inauguration is performed, and the person chosen is clothed with all the authority of the office. But in what does the mystery consist? Not in the chief Justice who administers the oath, that communicates, in some undefinable manner, a new character to the man, and invests him with new powers. It is the constitution of the country which expresses the sovereign will of the people, that gives to the President all his power. Beyond that he has no more power than any other citizen, and by that he does not occupy a mysterious and unapproachable position of isolation from those whose servant he is. So, it is the gospel of Jesus Christ, expressing as it does the sovereign will of the Head of the Church, and which is the great fundamental law and constitution of the Church, and whose provisions the Church is to have carried out, that gives to the minister all his right and authority. Upon the Church is thrown the responsibility of training suitable persons to the office, judging of their qualifications, declaring their fitness, inducting them formally into office, and preventing the intrusion of ignorant, and wicked men into the ministry. The Church cannot rid itself of this responsibility. Now what is there in this simple transaction that should separate the minister so widely from others in the Church. Is it not time we clear away the mist which superstition has thrown around the sacred office? Why should not intelligent pious laymen have a voice in deciding who are fit subjects for its administration?

But, says the objector, you are letting down the dignity of the sacred office entirely to low. But how could the character, honor and dignity of the office be better established and maintained, than by removing from it all high pretensions which have no foundation in fact, and cannot therefore be supported. The means, here proposed for the perpetuation of the ministry, seem perfectly adapted to the end arrived at, and therefore are least objectionable. By throwing the responsibility upon the Church, as our Lord evidently has done in regard to the qualifications of those who would become

her teachers, watchfulness and care are secured, so that those who are brought into the ministry will not only be entitled to, but will receive all the respect due to their high calling. In this country we deny the *divine right of kings*, and yet we believe that the "powers that be" are "ordained of God." So that when the people select one of their number to administer the laws of the land, and place him in office, we regard him just as truly a divinely appointed magistrate as any monarch in Europe. So when the people see the clergy renouncing all mysterious claims to honor, and acting as though they felt, that they have received a trust from them, to discharge for their benefit, then will they be disposed to regard the office with the highest reverence, and the ministerial character will exert the greatest moral influence. We cannot admit, as legitimate, the claims for the ministry put forth, upon the principle *jure divino*, until it shall be proved that the labors of those who assert them are alone blessed by the Head of the Church. Until this can be done, or what would be the same thing, an express declaration of scripture found to authorize these claims, they cannot be admitted as just, and founded in truth.

In the form of ordination contained in the Liturgy, of the General Synod it is said: "The first preachers of the gospel received their commission immediately from our Lord himself; and they ordained by the laying on of hands, such as they deemed qualified to be their fellow laborers and successors. Thus has one minister ordained another to the service of Christ down to the present time." This seems to convey the idea that one minister selects, ordains, and sends forth another minister, and that the office is received by the one from the other, and that the one possesses an inherent divine right to make the bestowment. If this be the idea, where is the Scripture authority for it? Christ committed this work to the Church, and ministers act in the matter only as officers of the Church, and not by any *jure divino* inherent in themselves. Further it is said: "This is by no means an outward or unmeaning ceremony. Ordination administered and received in true faith, is accompanied by the blessing and sanction of the Head of the Church, and thus confirms unto those, who have been duly called, plenary power to discharge the duties of the ministry." Here Ordination is only the confirmation of authority, which the Church has consented to give to the individual, and the blessing of the Head of the Church is made dependent upon the faith of the parties con-

cerned, that is the Church and the candidate. But suppose there is no faith exercised, still the "power to discharge the duties of the ministry" is confirmed. The preacher is not mysteriously invested with anything, the consent of the Church that he should be a minister is confirmed, he has been appointed to the office, that is all.

What then is the *rationale* of Ordination? Why nothing more or less than this, *to secure a succession of pious, zealous and capable teachers in the Church of Christ, and to secure the judgment, and concurrence of the Church, through several competent persons in a matter of so much importance.* But it will not do to be satisfied with any amount of mere reasoning on a subject of this nature. Therefore, we shall now turn to the Scriptures and try to show that the views we have here presented are sustained by the New Testament. There are not many passages to examine, for the word ordain, in the sense of inducting into office does not frequently occur in the New Testament. And, we think, we are justified in confining our inquiries to this portion of the sacred volume, because it is with the Christian ministry, we have to do, and not with the Jewish priesthood. Let us then examine every passage in which the term, in the sense of choosing or setting apart to an office occurs.

Mark 3 : 14. "And he *ordained* twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." The original word here rendered ordained, is εποιησε, which is generally translated *to make.* A more general and indefinite word than this could scarcely be found. Hence this passage determines nothing in reference to the mode of Ordination. It only states the fact, that Jesus appointed twelve Apostles, Judas Iscariot being one of them. How, we know not.

John 15 : 16. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and *ordained* you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain; that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." Here the Greek word εθηκα, is used, which in English means *to place*, and is about as indefinite as the former word. This passage simply declares the fact also, that Christ had appointed or designated the twelve to go forth as teachers of his religion, and had qualified them for being successful teachers.

Acts 1 : 21, 22. "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in

and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be *ordained* to be a witness with us of his resurrection." In this passage we have the word γενεσθαί, which ordinarily means to *be*, to *exist*, and more remotely to *make*. This word is, if anything, more indefinite than the others. "The expression does not imply that he must be set apart in any *particular manner*, but simply that one should be designated or appointed for this specific purpose, *to be a witness*, of the resurrection of Christ."

Acts 14: 23. "And when they had *ordained* them elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." The original χειροτονησαντες, here used is somewhat more limited in its signification, than any word yet referred to. It is only found in one other place in the New Testament, 2 Cor. 8: 19, where it is applied to Luke, and translated, "who was also *chosen* of the Church (i. e., appointed, or elected by suffrage by the Churches), to travel with us" etc. The verb properly means *to stretch out the hand*, and has allusion to the manner of voting by elevating the hand, and hence signifies to appoint or elect. In the case of Luke it was nothing more than the appointment to a particular office; just as if the Kansas Relief Committee of New York should appoint some person worthy of trust, to bear their contributions to the distressed inhabitants of Kansas. It is said, indeed, that Paul and Barnabas did this, but nothing more is meant than that they presided when the choice was made. This word determines nothing in reference to the manner of Ordination. 1 Tim. 2: 7. "Whereunto I am *ordained* a preacher and apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not,) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity." Here Paul speaks of himself. He uses the same word noticed above in John 15: 16. Here it is ετεθην, and means "I am placed or constituted." It does not convey the technical signification now attached to the word ordain. Titus 1: 5. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and *ordain* elders in every city as I had appointed thee." This word καταστησης, simply means to *constitute*, *appoint* or *ordain* to an office; as in Luke 12: 14, "Man, who *made* me a judge or divider over you." Acts 7: 10. "And he *made* him governor over Egypt and all his house." Heb. 5: 1. "For every high-priest taken from among men is *ordained* for men," etc. There are many oth-

er passages in which this word occurs but no where does it imply the performance of an ordination service, and therefore determine the manner of ordaining.

These, we believe, are all the passages in the New Testament in which the word ordain occurs in the sense of appointing to an office. In the original, five different words are used, three of which are the most indefinite and general terms in the language, and the other two are used to express the ordinary appointments to office among men. Why this indifference in the use of terms, if there is something so wonderful and mysterious in the manner or act of ordination? Do not the sacred writers speak on this subject, very much as we in this country do of the appointment of civil officers, when we say that a man is chosen, made, or appointed, a governor, judge or magistrate? Hence there seems to be nothing more mysterious in the one than in the other, except that the one is a much higher and important office than the other. In both cases the appointment means something important, that the individual has been invested with an important office, and this importance is in proportion to the interests involved. Evidently the technical signification commonly attached to ordination, is not conveyed in a single instance, in which the term is used in the New Testament.

But the rite of Ordination ought to be administered by some body, and in some way, We have already stated why it is proper that the ceremony should be performed by ordained ministers, and by the laying on of hands. Let us now see whether the views, which have been presented, harmonize with the ordinations, of which accounts are given in the New Testament.

The first one is recorded in Acts 6: 1–7. "In those days when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, it is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Anti-

och, whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed they laid hands on them. And the word of God increased; and the number of disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." In this instance the "brethren," laymen we presume, "looked out," seven men approved by them, that is the "brethren," brought them to the apostles, and *they* prayed, and *ordained* them by the laying on of hands. They set them apart, or appointed them, or confirmed the judgment of the brethren in selecting them for the deacon's office. This we would call an installation. Yet Stephen not only preached, but wrought miracles also.

The next instance is found in Acts 13 : 1–3. "Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod, the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Here the persons were designated by the Holy Ghost. And although they had previously been invested with the office of the sacred ministry, yet as they were to become missionaries among the Gentiles, it was necessary that they should be appointed or ordained to this special work. Whether Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen, who administered the rite to Barnabas and Saul, were themselves ordained ministers of the gospel or not (and who can prove that they were?) does not materially effect the validity of the act.

In 1 Tim. 4 : 4, Paul speaks to his son Timothy concerning his ordination thus: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Here was the ordination of a preacher. How and by whom was it done? The word rendered "presbytery" in this passage, occurs only in two other places in the New Testament. In Luke 22 : 66, it is rendered "elders;" and in Acts 22 : 5, it is rendered "estate of the elders." It properly means *an assembly of aged men; a council of elders;* and by no means does it necessarily mean an assembly of *ordained* ministers only. In Luke and Acts it refers to the Jewish Sanhedrim. But Timothy was not ordained by that body surely. Paul certainly was a member, and probably president of the Council (or Synod) by

which Timothy was ordained, but who can say that his associates, many of them at least, were not aged, intelligent laymen? In his second epistle to Timothy, Paul says, 1: 6. "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of *my* hands." In the next verse Paul specifies what "the gift of God," here spoken of, was. It is the spirit "of power" to bear trials, "of love" to God and man, and "of a sound mind," a mind well balanced and under right influences. This spirit Timothy was exhorted to cultivate as a preacher of the gospel. The meaning evidently is that these qualifications had been conferred by God, and that the gift had been recognized by the Church in his ordination. It does not mean that any mysterious influences had gone from the hands of the ordainers, imparting any holiness or gifts to Timothy which he had not before.

Besides these passages, Paul refers to the subject of ordination several times in his letters to Timothy and Titus. The instances are these, 1 Tim. 5: 22. "Lay hands suddenly on no man; neither be thou partaker of other men's sins." 2 Tim. 2: 2. "And the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou unto faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Titus 1: 5. "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city." With regard to the manner of ordaining, Paul says nothing more than what is implied in his reference to the laying on of hands. That Timothy and Titus were commissioned to ordain without the judgment and concurrence of the people, the Church, does not appear. That they presided on these solemn occasions there is no doubt, but that laymen had nothing to do in the matter, has never been proved.

Now when it is remembered how much has been said and written on the subject of ordination by learned men in the Church, it is surprising that the sacred writers say so little concerning it; that they use so few words, and those words the most indefinite and general in the language; that they use them without caution or explanation, in short that they make so little of it. Would this be so, were the rite invested with all the importance that some attach to it? How vastly different is the case when they speak of the *qualifications* of the candidate for the gospel ministry. On this point the

sacred writers express themselves with great caution, and peculiar earnestness. Take the following passages as examples in point: 1 Tim. 3: 1–7. "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop he desireth a good work." "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy-lucre; but patient; not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity, (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?) not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the Devil; moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the Devil," etc. 1 Tim. 5: 17. "Let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." 2 Tim. 2: 2. "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Verses 24 and 25. "And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves." Titus 1: 5–9. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate, holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers."

These qualifications in the estimation of the apostle are those which are of the first and greatest importance; and in these, others besides the ministers have an interest, and should, if possible, be led to manifest a deeper concern. As to the manner of ordination, Paul lays no stress upon it, but in reference to the qualifications of ministers, he gives "line upon line, and precept upon precept." He not only refers to the moral, but also, to the intellectual qualifications, necessary to a faithful discharge of the functions of the sacred office. Hence we conclude that from the teachings of the New Testament also, the *rationale* of ordination seems to be: *to*

*secure a succession of pious, zealous, and capable teachers in the Church of Christ, and to secure the judgment, and concurrence of the Church, through several competent persons in a subject of so much importance.* In the light of reason and the New Testament, therefore what is there in the ordination of a candidate for the ministry, that should exclude pious intelligent laymen from participating in his examination, voting on the question of his fitness, and even (under circumstances which might occur) laying their hands upon his head, invoking the blessing of the Great Master upon him, and bidding him go forth and preach, in the name of the Lord. Is there anything implied or asserted in the New Testament, to which alone we appeal, to forbid this?

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### HYMN FROM THE GERMAN.

Translated by Rev. MATTHIAS SHEELEIGH, Philadelphia, Pa.

### MISSIONARY HYMN.

*"Jesu, bittend kommen wir."*
*Mel. "Gott sey Dank in aller Welt."*

Jesus, now we bring our plea,
Praying, with thine own, to thee:
Hear our earnest childlike cry;
What we seek do not deny.

Jesus, in our midst be known;
Let us wholly be thine own:
Send on us thy Spirit, Lord,
As is promised in thy word.

Bid the Church, from deadness wake,
And deceitful peace forsake:
Thou the glory of thy name,
Over all the land proclaim.

Loudly sounding, let thy word
Far and wide be quickly heard:
Give the heathen all to see
Gospel grace and peace from thee.

Open wide each nation's door;
Spread the reign to every shore,

O'er all enmity and might,—
Calling day from out the night.

To thy heralds life impart,
Hoping faith and glowing heart:
Plenteous fruit of grace be known
From the seed in weeping sown.

Zion, bless the Lord above!
All thy pray'rs he hears in love:
See his reign o'er earth extend!
Who his joy can comprehend?

---

# ARTICLE IX.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*History of the United Netherlands.* From the death of William the Silent, to the Synod of Dort. With a full view of the English-Dutch struggle against Spain, and of the destruction of the Spanish Armada. By John Lothrop Motley, LL. D., D. C. L., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, Author of the Rise of the Dutch Republic. 2 vols.: New York, Harper & Brothers, 1861. We are glad to welcome these volumes from the pen of the accomplished author, one of our own countrymen, who has conferred so high an honor upon American literature, and placed the whole world under obligation to him for the successful and brilliant prosecution of the task undertaken by him. This new work will add to his reputation as an historian. Mr. Motley possesses peculiar qualifications for the labors to which he has devoted himself. He unites, in an eminent degree the power of patient investigation, and that of vivid representation. He loves his work, and engages in it with all that zest, so essential to success. He always rises to the measure of his subject, placing himself in genial sympathy with his characters, and inspiring his readers with the same enthusiasm. No one can peruse the thrilling narrative and description without catching something of the same spirit. "History," as the author well observes, "has few so fruitful examples of the dangers, which come from superstition and despotism, and the blessings which flow from the maintenance of religious and political freedom as those, afforded by the struggle between England and Holland on the one side, and Spain and Rome on the other, during the epoch," which he describes. For this reason he enters minutely into the secret details of this conspiracy of king and priest against the people, and shows, how it was baffled by the strong energies of two free nations combined, and the Protestantism of Europe saved. The history is, therefore, "not exclusively the history of Holland. It is the story of the great combat between despotism, sacerdotal and regal, and the spirit of rational, human liberty. * * * The quarrel was in its nature irreconcilable and eternal, as the warfare between wrong and right; and the establishment of a comparative civil liberty in Europe and America was the result of the religious wars of

the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." The period occupied by these two volumes is from 1584 to 1590; two additional volumes will complete the work, carrying the history of the Republic down to the Synod of Dort, the appearance of which will be anticipated by the literary public with deep interest.

The enterprising publishers have issued the work in their usual, attractive style. A portrait of the Prince of Parma is prefixed to the first volume, and that of the Earl of Leicester to the second.

*Quinti Horatii Flacci opera omnia ex recensione A. J. Macleane.*

*Æschylus ex novissima recensione Frederici A. Paley. Accessit verborum qua præcipue notanda sunt et nominum index.*

*M. Tullii Ciceronis Cato Major sive de Senectute Cælius sive de Amicitia et Epistolæ selectæ recensuit* G. Long: New York, Harper & Brothers, 1861. We are very much gratified with the appearance of this beautiful series of the Classics, designed as text-books for our Academies and Colleges. There is just the text, presented in an attractive form, clear type, excellent paper and flexible binding, without any annotations or the ordinary appliances, which so often retard rather than facilitate the progress of the student. He is here thrown upon his own resources, and thus, by means of the Grammar and Dictionary, with the instruction furnished in the recitation-room, is likely to become the more accurate and thorough scholar. The Harpers deserve the gratitude of the friends of sound learning, for the service they are rendering, and we trust, they may be so much encouraged in the enterprise, which they have commenced, as to complete, in this form, the whole series of classical authors, usually read in our Collegiate course.

*Religious Cases of Conscience answered in an evangelical manner.* By the Rev. S. Pike and the Rev. S. Hayward. New edition, with an introduction by the Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1859. This is a religious treatise of intrinsic, decided value. Although more than a century has elapsed, since the matter was first published, the volume is still in demand. Few uninspired books have been more useful. All genuine religious experience preserves a substantial identity from age to age, and the cases of conscience, presented in the work, occur as often in our day as in the past. Without endorsing every sentiment and expression, which the volume contains, we are free to say, that it is worthy of the place it has so long held in the affections of the Church, and the publishers have done a good service in bringing it before the public in a new dress.

*Life among the Chinese:* With Characteristic Sketches and Incidents of Missionary Operations, and Prospects in China. By Rev. R. S. Maclay, M. A. Thirteen years Missionary to China, from the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: Carlton & Porter, 1861. Our interest in this work has been enhanced by a personal acquaintance with the author, who will be remembered by many of our readers, formerly members of our Institutions, as occupying, for a season, the itinerancy in the Methodist Episcopal Church of Gettysburg. The volume presents a careful and well arranged digest of the observations and missionary labors of thirteen years' residence in a most important, yet hopeful, field of Christian enterprise. The unsatisfactory form of a journal is avoided, and the reader is furnished with a discussion of distinct topics, such as the history of China, its moral condition, its ancient religious faith, customs, government, institutions and laws, the character of the people and the schools, with entertaining and characteristic sketches and pic-

tures of missionary life, which have come under the author's own observation. The book contains a large amount of useful information, and will amply repay a perusal. The Christian philosopher also will find in the volume food for serious thought, whilst the narrative cannot fail to prove a valuable incentive to missionary labor, and awaken an interest on behalf of a country, which has claims, so strong upon our sympathies and efforts. The publishers have done their part in excellent style.

*Soldier's Pocket Library.* American Tract Society: New York. The publications of the American Tract Society are among the most beautiful and useful, which come from the press. Always keeping before it the object, for which the Society was established, and ever ready for its errand of mercy, its issues are suited to every circumstance and occasion, and their circulation never fails to produce the most blessed results. Since the Federal troops first moved towards the seat of war, the Society has been sending after them, to their various encampments, spiritual truth. The Pocket Library consists of twenty-five volumes, all on practical subjects, by such writers as Ryle, Scott, Cecil and Davies, and at the low price of two dollars for the whole series. The Christian, who is anxious to do good, may render important aid by furnishing the Society with the means for extending its usefulness among the soldiers and sailors in the service of the government.

We have also received from the same House the following publications: *The Blue Flag*, *Captain Hedley Vicars*, *General Havelock*, *Captain Hammond*, embraced in the series of the Soldier's Camp Library, all of them specially adapted to the officers in the army.

*The Rock.* With an Introduction by Rev. Henry A. Boardman, D. D. American Sunday School Union. Philadelphia. The writer of this work has been engaged for nearly a half century in the religious instruction of young persons in Sunday schools, and for a large portion of this time has had charge of one or two weekly Bible Classes. From a man of so ripe experience, we are prepared to expect an able work, and we are not disappointed. It is a book of great value, not only furnishing information with regard to the Bible, the necessity of revelation, its evidences, the canon of Scripture and its paramount authority, which every one of reflection desires to have, but presenting with great force and success, the nature of genuine piety, and the difficulties, duties and privileges of the Christian.

*The Teacher Taught:* A Humble Attempt to make the Path of the Sunday School Teacher straight and plain. New edition, improved and enlarged. American Sunday School Union.

*The Teacher Teaching:* A Practical View of the Relations and Duties of the Sunday School Teacher. Philadelphia: Sunday School Union. These are new and improved editions of works well known, which may be cordially recommended to those who are engaged in the work of Sabbath school instruction. The American Sunday School Union is doing a good work for our country by its appropriate and seasonable publications.

*Funeral Discourse of Stephen M. Summers*, delivered November 25, 1860, in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Wooster, O. By Rev. J. B. Baltzly, A. M.

*An Address on the Conditions of Intellectual Success*, delivered May 31, before the Phrenakosmian Society of the Augustana Seminary. By Rev. Geo. A. Bowers, A. M., Pastor of the First English Lutheran Church, Chicago, Ill., 1861.

## CONTENTS OF NO. LI.


Article. Page.

I. Slavery among the Ancient Hebrews, . 311

Translated from the German, by H. I. Schmidt, D. D., Professor in Columbia College, New York.

II. Remarks on Matthew VI: 25–34, . 355

By E. Greenwald, D. D., Easton, Pa.

III. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers, . . . . . 362

IV. Isaac Blessing Jacob, . . . . . 375

By Rev. J. K. Plitt, A. M., Pillipsburg, N. J.

V. John Gottlieb Fichte, . . . . 386

Translated from the German, by Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, A. M., Erie, Pa.

VI. A Call to the Christian Ministry, . 412

By Rev. H. L. Dox, Lockport, N. Y.

VII. Exposition on Rom. viii: 33—30, . . 428

VIII. Dissensions among Christians, . . 436

IX. Hymn from the German, . . . . 449

By Rev. M. Sheeleigh, A. M., Philadelphia.

X. Notices of New Publications, . . 450

*The Evangelical Review*, Gettysburg, Pa. W. M. Reynolds, D. D., and Prof. M. L. Stoever, Editors. This periodical is a work of essential importance to all, who would keep themselves informed in regard to the progress of affairs and of opinion in the very interesting and venerable branch of the Church, which it represents. Contents of the October number: 1. State of the Country (showing the destructive and subversive nature of the doctrines of State Sovereignty). 2. The Bible and Geology (setting forth with uncommon clearness the mode of reconciling Geology and Genesis, now most commonly received among Christian geologists). 3. The Ministerial Office. 4. A Bible Glossary. 5. Exposition of Matt. 19: 24. 6. Theses upon the Church. 7. The Nature of Ordination. 8. Hymn from the German. 9. Notices of New Publications. Unlike most of our theological quarterlies, this Review is out promptly.—*Sunday School Times* (*Phila.*)

The Evangelical Review, Gettysburg, Pa., in the April number, Article V, furnishes a list of publications by Lutherans in the United States — a valuable contribution to Bibliography. The list extends to thirty-four pages and includes many works of great merit in Theology and Church history.—*American Theological Review* (*New York*).

The October number of the *Review* is certainly one of the best which has yet appeared. Most of its papers are on living subjects which agitate the mind of the Church, and their fraternal discussion in the pages of the Review is attended with the best results. No one can attentively read the three articles on the 'Church Question' by the Rev. Messrs. Muhlenberg, Loy and Fink without rejoicing at the calm investigation of these vital issues, which have so much to do with the purity and efficiency of the Church of God. The 'Two Records of Creation' by the Rev. A. Essick of Gettysburg and 'A Bible Glossary' by the Rev. J. B. Bittinger of Cleveland, O., are both valuable and instructive papers. The Review has a most important work to perform in the Church, and it is cheering, amid the distraction of the times to see it so successfully holding its way.—*Missionary* (*Pittsburg*).

"So far as we have found time to progress in our perusal (Oct. No.) we take pleasure in bearing favorable testimony to the contents; and judging from first glance and the character of the contributors we expect to be equally gratified with what remains to be read. The first article by H. S. Dickson, D. D., on the '*State of the Country — Question at issue*,' is a very sensible, seasonable and well written production. Article II is from the chaste and well-pointed pen of Rev. A. Essick. This article aims at proving, which it does most triumphantly, the perfect harmony between the well-ascertained facts in the science of geology and the correctly interpreted teachings of the inspired writings. The style is elevated, the language pure, the argument lucid and convincing, the information imparted interesting and profitable and the entire disquisition exceedingly creditable to the author's research and ability. Article III on the '*Ministerial Office*' by Rev. M. Loy is an elaborate and heavy article, evincing extensive research and patient thought. Article IV '*A Bible Glossary*' by Rev. J. B. Bittinger is well put together, is interesting and instructive and we think the readers of the Review would be glad if the writer would continue his contributions on the subject.—*Lutheran Observer* (*Baltimore*).

The Evangelical Review for October has a varied and attractive table of contents; and the articles will not disappoint those who are drawn to them by their titles.—*Lutheran & Missionary* (*Phila*).

# THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. LI.

JANUARY, 1862.

## ARTICLE I.

### THE INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY AMONG THE ANCIENT HEBREWS, ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE AND THE TALMUD. BY DR. M. MIELZINER. A CONTRIBUTION TO HEBRAICO-JUDAIC ARCHÆOLOGY.*

Translated from the German, by H. I. Schmidt, D. D., Professor in Columbia College, New York.

### § 1.

*The leading Principles of the Legislation of Moses as respects Hebrew Slaves and Slaves that were not Hebrews.*

Among the religions and legislations of antiquity none could exhibit a spirit so decidedly averse to Slavery, as the religion and legislation of Moses; nor could any ancient nation find, in the circumstances of its own origin, such powerful motives to abolish that institution, as the people of Israel. A religion which insists so emphatically upon the exalted dig-

*The little work, of which a translation is here given, was published in 1859, at Copenhagen, under the title, "Die Verhältnisse der Sklaven bei den alten Hebräern, nach biblischen und talmudischen Quellen dargestellt. Ein Beitrag zur hebräisch-jüdischen Alterthums-Kunde, von Dr. M. Mielziner." The author is reputed to be the most learned Israelite now in Europe, and his treatise has attracted a great deal of attention in Germany, it being regarded, in that country, as, on the whole, the most satisfactory dissertation that we possess upon the subject of Hebrew Slavery. The translation was made some time ago, and, as it is simply a calm, scientific discussion of an important and deeply interesting branch of Biblical Archæology, written without the remotest reference to American Slavery and its peculiar aspects, it was hoped that

nity of man as a being created in the image of God*, a legislation which bases its laws upon that dignity of man†, and which enjoins, in all its enactments, not only the highest justice, but also the most tender kindness and the most considerate forbearance, especially toward the necessitous and the unfortunate; a people, lastly, which had itself pined under the yoke of bondage, and had become a nation only through its deliverance from servitude; all these must have made it their object to abrogate, if possible, the unnatural state of slavery, so degrading to the human being.

At the time of the Mosaic legislation, however, Slavery was still too deeply and firmly rooted in the economy of all nations, to admit of its complete abolition among the Israelitish nation, without serious peril to their domestic affairs. Besides, slavery afforded, within certain restrictions, divers important advantages, which could not, under the existing circumstances, be disregarded. For, as the relation of the hired laborer, in other words, labor for wages, had not yet been regulated, the man who had, either through his own improvidence, or in consequence of unavoidable misfortunes, become so impoverished as to be no longer able to maintain himself and his family, could in no other way procure the necessary support and secure himself against the temptation to steal secretly or to rob forcibly, than by becoming a slave, but in the event of such an infringment of the right of property having actually taken place, slavery was, because the earliest constitution of the Israelitish nation knew nothing of punishment by imprisonment,‡ well adapted to serve as a

there would be no difficulty in obtaining a publisher, especially as a number of eminent scholars and theologians had expressed a strong desire to see it introduced to the American public. But the dread of giving offence to the South was too strong, and every publishing house applied to, declined. This was before the fate of Sumter. Since then the translator has had no inclination to renew his efforts on behalf of what, he acknowledges, cost him a great deal of labor.

All the Hebrew in the original is without the vowel-points: these the translator has, for obvious reasons,§ supplied, together with the translation, in all words and passages taken from the Scriptures. The many passages cited from the Talmud and other Rabbinical writings he has left as he found them.

*Gen. I, 26, 27: v, 1. Lev. XIX, 2.

†Gen. IX, 6. In other passages not expressly declared, but indicated. Cf. Deut. XXI, 23: XXV, 3.

‡Although punishment by imprisonment had become known to the Hebrews in Egypt, (Cf. Gen. XXXIX, 20: XL, 3, 4: XLI, 10: XLII, 19), the use of it is no where prescribed by the law of Moses. It is true

§Omitted in the printing for want of type.

disciplinary arrangement for punishing the thief who had no property, by depriving him of his freedom. Hence the legislation of Moses did not yet directly interfere with Slavery, but made it a prominent object to put an end to the inhumanity and severity which characterized the institution among other nations, and to prepare the way for the complete abolition of it, in the first instance in favor of members of the Hebrew commonwealth, by so limiting the duration and the conditions of the slavery of a Hebrew, that it scarcely deserved to be called Slavery any more. How much the legislator had both the amelioration and the ultimate abolition of slavery at heart, is manifest from the circumstance, which cannot be regarded as accidental, that, whereas in the Decalogue which forms the ground-work of the entire legislation, slaves are mentioned in the fourth commandment (Exod. XX, 10), and the rest of the Sabbath is secured to them, equally whether they were of Hebrew or foreign descent, the first law which limits the slavery of a Hebrew is found at the very head of all the special provisions (Exod. ch. XXI) made by the legislation of Moses.

As he proceeds in unfolding his legislation, the lawgiver announces two principles, which may be regarded as the soul of all his enactments regarding slaves.

The first of these principles occurs frequently, especially in the laws which enjoin kindness and tender consideration in the treatment of strangers, of the oppressed and the unfortunate,* and was regarded as more particulary applicable to Slaves. This principle may be stated, in general terms, as follows:

"Israel was once himself a slave in Egypt and there suffered grievous oppression and severity, from which divine mercy has at last delivered him; how then should he desire in like manner to oppress those who are under his authority or in adverse circumstances, and not rather show them mercy and kindness?"

If this principle forms the basis of all the provisions which

that imprisonment, a putting in ward, is historically mentioned in Levit. XXIV, 12: and Numb. XV, 34: but the object of this was not punishment, but the detention of a criminal until the sentence could be passed upon him. It is not until the time of the later kings that imprisonment occurs as punishment; but even then it is not the result of a judicial decison, but an arbitrary exhibition of despotic power.

*Exod. XXII, 21: XXIII, 9: Deut. V, 14, 15: X, 19: XV, 15: XVI, 11, 12: XXIV, 18, 22.

the law makes, in a general way, in favor of slaves, whether Hebrews or not Hebrews, we find the still more favorable position assigned to the slave of *Israelitish* descent based upon the second principle here referred to:

Israel has, since his deliverance out of Egypt, entered the service of God,—has become his servant. But the servant of the Lord ought not to become the servant of men. Perpetual and real servitude cannot, therefore, exist among Israelites, for it would be a virtual denial of the sovereignty of God*. Hence the restriction established as regards the time during which an Israelite might be kept in servitude, and the rule laid down, that he should not, during that period, be treated as a bondman or serf, but as a hireling only. It is true that this second principle accrued directly to the benefit only of a citizen of the Hebrew commonwealth, yet it is certain that in its enforcement the way was already prepared for the total abolition of slavery, not only among the Israelites, but among all nations. For with the diffusion of the knowledge of God among all nations, in which Israel was to be instrumental, these would also be elevated to the dignity of servants of God, and thus not only with reference to them also†, but actually among themselves even, the principle would go into effect, that he who serves God, cannot become the slave of a man. So long, however, as this had not yet taken place, so long as the heathen nations remained in their false relation toward God, and thus recognized for themselves the possibility of their being degraded into a state of bondage to men, so long the law regarded their slaves as such, and insisted, for the time being, only upon the observance towards them of every possible consideration of humanity and kindness.

*Levit. XXV, 42, 55: XXVI, 13.

†The disposition of Judaism to observe this logical consistency in carrying out the principles of the divine law, appears from the Rabbinical exposition in the Talmud, Tract. Gittin. fol. 38 and 39, where it is declared, that the Israelitish master is bound to set at liberty his heathen bondsman, just so soon as the latter had, with his consent, taken part in certain religious exercises. By means of such participation in those religious rites, the slave was, according to the same authority, regarded as having raised himself to the position of a servant of God, and could, as such, no longer remain the slave of a man. In Jebamoth, fol. 46, it is, in like manner, declared to be the meaning and intent of the law, that the slave whom an Israelite had bought of a heathen, without having, however, yet assumed the rights of a master over him, recovers his freedom immediately, so soon as he voluntarily receives the prescribed baptism, and declares his readiness to assume all the obligations of Judaism. Cf. Maimonides H. Issure biah XIII, 11.

## § 2.

### *General Terms denoting the Slave-Relation among the Hebrews.*

The most common word of the Hebrew language denoting a slave is עבד, pronounced Ebed. But this word, which is derived from the verb עבד (Abad) signifying *to labor, to serve*, denoted originally not merely the entirely unfree condition of a slave or serf, but was the common term for all whose position is one of servitude, dependence or subordination. It sometimes even expresses only the notion of moral subordination, sometimes, indeed, nothing more than submissiveness, and voluntary compliance with the demands of others: Cf. Prov. XIX, 29, I Kings XII, 17. Thus then the term עבד (Ebed) was far from signifying a relation so degrading as that which we designate with the word *Slave* or *Bondman;* on the contrary, the word had often the milder meaning which we, in certain connexions, attach to the word *Servant.* Thus even the highest officers of State were called עבדי המולך, "*Servants of the King,*" just as we say "*Ministers of State;*" and indeed, עבד ל, "*Servant of God,*" is the highest title of honor, conferred upon the prophets and upon pious worshippers of God. In conversation with persons of superior rank the word was also employed as an expression of courtesy, so that the speaker often designated either himself or some third person with the words, "thy Servant." See Genesis XVIII, 3, and other places*. It is therefore only from the context that we can ascertain whether the word is used to denote a condition of actual servitude, or whether it is to be understood in a figurative sense.

The opposite of עבד (Ebed) is designated, sometimes by אדון (pronounced Adohn), frequently in the *pluralis majestatis* אדנים signifying lord, master; at other times by חפש, which denotes the free or independent man.

*As merely designating the humility of the speaker, or of some third person referred to, in conversation with a person of superior rank, the word seems to have fallen into disuse in later times. At any rate no such designation occurs in the later books of the Bible [the O. T. tr.] except in prayer, or in conversation with men in power. As early as the times of the Talmud the word had so completely lost every shade of milder signification, that to call any free man עבד (Aebed) was looked upon as the grossest insult, which was, in fact, punished with excommunication. הקורא לחבירו עבד יהא בנידוי Kidushin 28.

Terms of more comprehensive meaning than עבד (Ebed), but less frequently used, are such as indicate, at the same time, the manner in which the master obtained possession of his slaves, whether by purchase, or by their being the children of any of his married slaves. Such terms are the following: מקנת כסף, also קניו כסף, which both denote a servant "*bought with money*," (See Gen. XVII, 12, XIII, 23; Exod. XII, 24; Levit. XXII, 11). Also יליד בית "*he that is born in the house*," בן בית, "*born in his house*," [literally "*Son of the house*] and בן אמיה, "*the son of the* [*thy*] *handmaid*" (Gen. XIV, 14: XV, 3: XVII, 23; Exod. XXIII, 12; Levit. XLI, 6. Koheleth [i. e. Ecclesiastes] II, 7; Ps. LXXXVI, 16: CXVI 16; Jerem. II, 14).

The female slave was designated by two distinct terms: אמה [Amah] and שפחה [Shiphcha]. The latter term, often used as the opposite of גברת [Gbereth] "*mistress* (Gen. XVI, 4; Ps. CXXIII, 2; Prov. XXX, 23; Is. XXIV, 2,) seems to denote a relation more dependent and humble than אמה* [Amah]. (Cf. 1 Sam. XXV, 41; Exod. XI, 5).

* אמה seems to be the *general* term for female slave, just as אמהו in Chaldaic, Syriac and Arabic, and all pronounced like אמה, designate nothing more than female slave, whereas שפחה (probably related to משפחה, which occurs only in Hebrew,) probably denoted only a certain class of female slaves, who performed the meanest menial services of the household, and were under the special control of the mistress of the family (גברה). This may serve to explain why Hagar, who is, in the 16th ch. of Gen. always called שפחה שרי, is subsequently always denominated אמה. For through the birth of Ishmael she was raised above the degraded condition in which she had stood relative to Sarah, and became simply אמה. Bilha and Silpa, on the contrary, always remained in their debased relation towards Jacob's two wives, to whom they had been given by Laban, whence they are always (with the sole exception of Gen. XXX, 3, where אמה in the mouth of Rachel who was still very young, is a mere euphemism) called שפחות [handmaids]. The law of Moses, which addresses itself more directly to the male, and has reference, whenever it speaks of female slaves, only to the serving woman in general, employs, therefore, always the terms אמתן and אמהו. Once only (Levit. XIX, 20) שפחה is used; but it is here emphatic, as it is intended to give prominence to her debased condition, which circumstance distinguishes this case from that in Deut. XXII, 23, 24. In the historical portions of the Bible, whenever it is unnecessary to give prominence to any distinction, particularly when the word handmaid is employed by a woman, in a figurative sense, to denote submissiveness, both אמה and שפחה are used. It may be observed, however, that [in the plural] שפחות occurs more frequently than אמהות, probably, in part, because there is something anomalous in the latter plural form. It is necessary to note also the usage observed in the Mischna and the Gemara, in which the Hebrew serving woman is, as a rule, called אמה עבריה the heathen bondwoman, on the contrary, in every instance, שפחה כנענית. Deviations from

As the Romans used *puer* and the Greeks παῖς, so the Hebrews also employed, when speaking in a familiar manner, the word נער [naar], "*boy*," "*fellow*," to denote the slave, and it was even applied to old slaves, such as, e. g., Ziba (2 Sam. XVI, 1), who was, according to ch. IX, v. 10, already the father of fifteen children. The corresponding term נערה [naarah], "*maid*," "*girl*," was used to denote the female slave.

The whole number of Slaves belonging to any one master (*the familia* of the Romans was called עכרה, Gen. XXVI, 14; Job I, 3.

## I. *The Condition of Slaves who were themselves Hebrews.*

### § 3.

### A. *The Hebrew Bondman.*

Some have advanced the conjecture that עברי [Ibri], "*Hebrew*," is a term more comprehensive than "Israelite," so that the provisions of the law relating to the Hebrew slaves would apply, not only to the Israelitish slaves, but to those also who had been obtained from the other nations that had sprung from Abraham, the Hebrew (Gen. XIV, 13) or from *Eber*, the progenitor of Abraham (Gen. X, 21, 24: XI, 16). This notion is combated already by Ibn Esra, and justly so (in his comment to Exod. XXI), by proving, in a general way, from Exod. I, 13: v. 3, and Jonah I, 9, that עברי denotes only an Israelite*, and by appealing, with reference to the

this usage, such as those which occur in Baba Mez. I, 5, and Erubin VII, 6. ושפחו העבים עברו, are rare. Saalschütz, M. R. p. 708, note 911, suggests that "Schiphcha may denote a bondwoman who had not yet been married, Amah, on the contrary, one who had." This theory is confuted by the circumstance mentioned above, that the law always employs the word Amah, and that the only passage in which it makes use of the word Schiphcha (Levit. XIX, 20), refers to the case of a married bondwoman.

*Ewald (Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language, §4) observes, that all the descendants of Eber, hence also the Ishmaelites, the posterity of Esau, etc., should, indeed, call themselves Hebrews, but that, as the collateral lines gradually obtained particular names,, the name Hebrew had continued to be pre-eminently the appellative of the direct descendants of Eber through Abraham. As regards the difference between the two names, *Israelites* and *Hebrews*, the same author says (Ib. §3), that Israelite is the sacred or religious name. Hebrews, on the contrary, is the ordinary, vulgar national appellative, which is to be regarded as merely distinguishing the nation from other nations, irrespective, entirely of religion.

Hebrew slave, particularly to Deut. xv, 12, and Jerem. xxxiv, 9, where the law is, by the addition of the words אחיך in the one and יהודי in the other place, expressly limited to the Israelitish Slave. Besides these citations, Michaelis (M. R. § 127) adduces Levit. xxv, 44, where the Israelites are authorized to hold Slaves for life from among the surrounding peoples. But these peoples were, for the most part either direct descendants of Abraham or of his brother's son, as, for example, the Ishmaelites, Midianites, Edomites, Ammonites and Moabites. But as no Canaanites were, according to Deut. xx, 16, sqq., to be made slaves, there would, if the above named peoples were also to be excluded, scarcely any neighboring nation have been left, from among whom the regular slaves could be taken. According to the principle unfolded above (§ 1), which determined the character of the Mosaic legislation respecting slaves, it can be no longer open to question, that by עבד עברי none but the Israelitish slave is meant, since the reason assigned in Levit. xxv, 42, 55, for the treatment he was to receive can have no particular application except to Israelites.

### 1. *The Hebrew Bondman in the Service of a Hebrew.*

### § 4.

#### a. *In what Manner could a Hebrew become a Slave?*

With that inward repugnance with which, as we have seen above, the legislation of Moses permitted, and that for a limited period only, the enslavement of a member of the Hebrew commonwealth, it was quite natural that this permission should be restricted to cases only of extreme necessity. In view of the relations prevailing among the Israelites, only two cases of this description could possibly arise.

1. When a man had been obliged to part with his hereditary possession, and could no longer maintain himself and his family by voluntary or free labor. In order to protect him and his family against extreme destitution, and the temptations which would attend it, and perhaps also, to afford him an opportunity to earn, by serving for several years, what would enable him to redeem the possession which he had sold (Levit. xxv, 26), and thus to re-establish his household, he was allowed to sell himself, for a specified time, to some rich man as his servant. Levit. xxv, 39.

Considering the love of liberty, which the perpetual rememberance of the deliverance from Egypt could not fail to keep alive in the breast of every Israelite, as also the degradation which must have been associated with Slavery, in the eyes of a people, who had been taught, in the earliest sacred history (Gen. IX, 25), that it had its origin in a *curse* pronounced upon *moral depravity*,—in view of all this the law could take for granted that no man would avail himself of this permission to surrender himself voluntarily into servitude, except only when, in consequence of his extreme destitution, he had no other resource left.*

2. When a man had stolen and was unable to make restitution. The object to be attained in this case was not only to restore his property to him, who had been robbed but also to punish the thief, when no other punishment was practicable, by at least depriving him for a time of his liberty. Hence the magistrate was to sell him for a time, and from the proceeds of the sale full restitution was to be made for his theft. Exod. XXII, 3.

According to Josephus† the thief was, as a rule, sold to the same man whom he had robbed, and that not only for the simple value of the stolen property, but for the fourfold or fivefold restitution prescribed by the law (Exod. XXII, 1). The Rabbins assert, that he could be sold to any other Hebrew, but, at all events, not publicly in the slave market, or "from the stone," and in this case he was sold only for the simple value of what he had stolen, without regard to four or five fold restitution.‡

These two cases are the only ones in which the law allowed the sale of a Hebrew. That insolvent debtors also, or their children (as Michaelis, Jahn, Scholz, Ewald and even Saalschütz maintain( could be made slaves or sold into bondage by the creditor, we most decidedly deny. An arrangement of this kind finds no support whatever in the Mosaic law, nor can the slightest trace of its having at any time existed

*What is here simply presumed has been represented by the Rabbins as having the character of a legislative enactment; for they assert that a man was not allowed to sell himself merely for the purpose of gain, but only after he had sold all that he possessed, except his last garment, in order to keep himself from starvation. Maim. Il. Abadim I, 2.

†δοῦλος ἔστω τοῖς καταδικασαμένοις, Ant. IV. 8, 27.

‡Kiduschin 18, a: בגניבתי ולא בכפילו, Cf. Maimon. Hilch. Gnevah. III, 12.

be found in the Rabbinical tradition*. It would, in fact, be utterly irreconcilable with the spirit that pervades all the provisions of the Mosaic law with regard to debtors. That the same law which forbids the creditor to retain over night the garment which his poor neighbor had given in pledge (Exod. XXII, 26, sq., Deut. XXIV, 12, sq.), or take to pledge any utensil essential to the interests of the family (Deut. XXIV, 6), or even to enter the house of his debtor, for the purpose of fetching thence what the debtor had pledged (Ib. XXIV, 10, sq.),—that such a law should give up to the arbitrary disposal of a hard-hearted creditor, the body and the liberty of an impoverished debtor of his children, is simply impossible.

It cannot, indeed, be denied that in 2 Kings IV, 1, and in Nehem. V, 5, we have historical examples, where creditors attempted to reduce the children of insolvent debtors to bondage; but here it is necessary to note, to what period these two examples belong. The first occurred during the reign of the house of Ahab in Israel, in which time all the laws of Moses were disregarded, and the second, during the period immediately succeeding the return from the Babylonish captivity, when the relations established by law had not yet been regulated. In both places, however, the whole tenor of the narrative shows that the proceeding of the creditors was illegal and unjust, having no foundation in any national custom, that conferred the right to institute such measures.†

The other passages, which have been relied upon in the attempt to prove that slavery, on account of unpaid debts, prevailed among the Hebrews, are even still less to the purpose.

If in Prov. XXII, 7, we read: ועבד לוה לאיש מלוה, "*the borrower is servant to the lender*," this is no more to be taken literally, than are the words found in ch. XI, v. 29: עבד אויל להכם לב "*the fool is servant to the wise man.*" On the contrary the word עבד conveys in both places, as in many others, only the

*In the Talmud Tract. Baba Kama 97 a., it is stated, in terms of disapprobation, that some man would have compelled the slaves of his debtor to work. In this place, however, the disapprobation expressed refers in reality to the usurious profit which it was attempted to realize, מיתזי כריבית.

†It appears to us that this is indicated already in the word צעקה, which occurs in both places (in 2 Kings IV, 1, as a verb, and in Nehem. V, 1, as a noun [צעקה), as this word frequently denotes a crying out at some grievous wrong endured (Cf. for example, Exod. XXII, 27; Job XIX, 7, and especially Isaiah V, 7, לצדקה והנה צעקה).

notion of dependence in civil society, or a relation of moral subordination toward one who occupies a higher position. The words which occur in the first v. of the 50th ch. of Is., where the prophet, speaking in the name of God, says: "which of my creditors is it, to whom I have sold you," prove no more than this, that the debtor sometimes surrendered objects in his possession and perhaps even slaves, in the way of sale, to his creditor, instead of paying him the sum of money which was due to him. But the passage by no means proves that the debtor or his children could, without their consent, be taken as slaves by the creditor, or sold by him into bondage.*

§ 5.

b. *The Duration of Bondage as restricted by the Law.*

Inasmuch as the law permitted, in the two cases, which we have described above, a member of the Hebrew commonwealth to become a bondman, it was necessary that, in accordance with the general principle, that a Hebrew, as a servant of God, could not, in the proper sense of the word, become a servant of men, it should restrict the duration of such servitude, in order that, by means of this restriction, the permitted sale of an Israelite might receive the character of a mere *hiring out* of the person thus sold.

For the accomplishment of this object two periods were appointed, at each of which the Hebrew servant was to recover his freedom without a ransom:

1. The seventh year, counting from the time when he was sold, Exod. XXI. 2, Deut. XV, 12.

2. The fiftieth year, or the year of Jubilee. Levit. XXV, 40.

Ordinarily the Hebrew servant recovered his liberty after six years of servitude, at the beginning of the seventh year,†

*As regards the argument which it has been attempted to derive from Matt. XVIII, 25, Kall has already remarked correctly: "Ibi non historia scribitur, sed pingitur parabola eaque fortasse ad mores Romanorum adcommodata, qui pridem in Judaea verum potiebantur. Apud illos scilicet malae fidei debitores solebant vendi."

†As the law aimed only at restricting the duration of slavery, it is a matter of course that it did not with the expression, "six years shall he serve," require that every term of service should, under all circumstances, last the full period of six years; its sole design was to fix the utmost length of time, that any term of servitude could continue. It is,

but if it happened that he was sold a few years before the year of jubilee he did not wait for the seventh year, but recovered his freedom as soon as the year of jubilee arrived.*

therefore, also a matter of course, that, when a man was sold into bondage a shorter term of service than six years could be stipulated; as e. g., when there was no necessity of a man's servitude lasting more than one or two years. This view of the subject is confirmed by the Rabbins, but only with respect to one who sold himself because of his poverty; according to their opinion, the man who was sold by the judges on account of theft, could only be sold for six years, and not for a shorter period. And accordingly, if the value of the stolen property was less than the wages of a term of six years service, the thief was not sold at all (Cf. Kiduschin 18, a., and Maimonides "concerning Theft," III, 14). We may here yet remark that, according to the dominant view of the most ancient Talmudists, as well as of the later Rabbinical commentators, there was a difference made in the application of the law, between the man who was sold by the judges because of his failing to make restitution for theft (הנמכר בגנב), and him who sold himself on account of poverty (המוכר את עצמו), inasmuch as the provisions of the law recorded, Exod. XXI, 2–6, and Deut. XV, 12, sqq., had reference only to the *former*, whereas the servant who had voluntarily gone into servitude on account of his poverty had been subject to no other rule than that laid down Levit. XXV, 40, so that the latter might sell himself for a longer period than six years, and *should* not recover his liberty, until the year of jubilee. At an earlier period, however, this opinion was combated by Rabbi Eliesar, who asserts (Kiduschin 14, b), that the man who went voluntarily into servitude was, by the law placed, in all respects, on the same footing as the thief who had been sold by the judges. It appears to us that this view is sustained by the following considerations:

1. There are no intimations whatever given in Exod. XXI, 2–6, and Deut. XV, 12, sqq., that there is, in those passages, reference only to the man who was sold for theft. The expression כי תקנה ["If thou buy"], which might be supposed to convey an intimation of this kind, proves nothing, since in Deut. XV. 12. כי ימכר ["if * * * * * be sold" etc.,] is used in the place of it (in like manner as in Levit. XXV, 39, לך ונמכר *unto thee*," or rather, the verb being in the form niphal, "have sold himself unto thee"]).

2. Although Levit. XXV, 39, sq., has, as we admit, more direct reference to the impoverished man who voluntarily accepts the state of bondage, the passage is, nevertheless, quite applicable to the man who was sold on account of theft, seeing that even the thief was not sold, unless he was too poor to make restitution for what he had stolen.

3. Lastly, the prophet Jeremiah (XXIV, 13), in referring to the law of Moses speaks, quite in a general way, of the emancipation of the bondman after the sixth year of service, without so much as hinting at any difference between the voluntary slave, and him whose servitude was compulsory. That all the slaves referred to, in that passage as having been kept in bondage beyond the legal term of service, should have been such as had been sold on account of theft for which no restitution had been made, is in the last degree improbable.

*In this way the provisions specified in Exod. XXI, 2, (resp. Deut. XIII, 12, sq.,) and Levit XXV, 40, mutually complete and elucidate each

That the seventh year, in which the slave was to recover his liberty really denotes the seventh year from the time when he was purchased, and not, as some have assumed; the Sabbatical year, is confirmed by the very circumstance, that

other, so as to preclude all contradiction as regards the different periods of time at which emancipation took place. In the last mentioned passage, only the dismission from servitude at the year of jubilee is spoken of, because that article of the law treats principally of the year of jubilee; in Exod. xxi, 2, (and Deut. xv, 12), on the contrary, it was more particularly designed to determine the usual time of dismission from bondage, whence no mention is made of the liberty which the year of jubilee, that occurred every fifty years, brought the slave even before the expiration of his six years' term of servitude.

We cannot here pass by, without some notice, the attempted explanation by Prof. Saalschütz (Das mosaische Gesetz, p. 702, sq.), intended to dispose of the seeming contradiction, above spoken of, between the legislative enactments concerning the duration of slavery recorded in Leviticus and in Exodus respectively. Prof. Saalschütz agrees in so far with the opinion of the Rabbins mentioned above as having been combated by Rabbi Eliesar, that he regards those two passages of the law as treating of entirely different sorts of persons, and maintains that the law in Levit. xxv, has exclusive reference to the impoverished Israelite, who had sold his possession until the year of jubilee, but who was allowed to sell his services for a longer term than six years, even down to the year of jubilee. But, whereas, according to the views of the Rabbins, the passages in Exod. and Deut. have regard only to the offender who had been sold for theft, it is the opinion of Saalschütz that these passages treat of "an entirely distinct category of servants, who, though not strictly speaking heathens, were yet not to be regarded as real Israelites but who, *as born in servitude, constituded a middle class* between the impoverished *Israelite* and the real slaves purchased from *heathens*." To this class he reckons, in the first instance, those who, the offspring of married slaves, had been born in the house of an Israelite, and then also purchased slaves who had been incorporated in the family and, in a measure, naturalized, by their submitting to the rite of circumcision. He conceives that this class is denoted by the term "*Hebrew Servants*," and that to these applies the legislative provision, that, in the event of their being sold by their original master, the second master should not have as much right over them as the first, but be obliged to give them their liberty in the seventh year. Prof. Saalschütz was led to the adoption of this opinion more particularly by the difficulty, which he conceives to be involved in the words, Exod. xxi, 2, "*if thou buy a Hebrew servant*," inasmuch as he deems the expression, "to buy one's self a servant," to be inapplicable to the acquisition of one, who had not yet, up to that moment, been a servant, but, on the contrary, an owner of property [real estate], whence he concludes, that this passage must of necessity refer to a real Hebrew servant, who had previously already rendered service as a bondman. Now, in the first place, as regards the difficulty just mentioned, it appears to us that this is far less than that which the explanation here offered would create. We cannot comprehend why the expression קנה עבד ["*to buy a slave*"] should necessarily pre-suppose, that the person to be purchased must have already been in a state of bondage, any more than that the use of the expressions משה מלך ["*to*

the law in every instance, mentions only the seventh year, without even employing the term "Sabbatical year," and that, in the descriptions of the Sabbatical year (Levit. xxv, 1–7, and Deut. xv, 1), not a word occurs about the emancipation of slaves.

The limitation of the term of service to six years, and the establishment of the seventh year as the year, in which slaves must be set at liberty, are enactments which, as has been remarked already by Abarbanel and also by Ewald, have an obvious connection with the notion of the Sabbath and of the Sabbatical year.* For, in the same manner as the weekly Sabbath should, after six days' labor, and the Sabbatical year after six years' labor in the field, serve to remind men of the Creator and Ruler of the world, who had allotted to man the cultivation and the productions of the soil, so the emancipation of the slave in the seventh year after a six year's term of servitude was designed to keep both the mas-

*anoint a king*"], (Judges ix, 8), and לקח אשה ["*to take a wife*"], or of these Latin phrases, *creare regem* [*to create a king*], *ducere uxorem* [*to marry a wife*], should pre-suppose that the person to be elected should have been already a king, or that the woman to be married should have previously been a wife. And then again we feel constrained to object to the attempted explanation itself, that, when the law respecting emancipation after a six year's term of servitude is repeated in Deut. xv, 12, the person sold is not even called עבד [slave or bondman], so that a reference to a prior state of servitude is not at all to be thought of in connection with that passage. And lastly, it is quite incomprehensible for what reason the entire special legislation in the book of Exodus should just open with provisions respecting that quite peculiar class of servants without having previously secured the freedom of those who were, in the proper sense of the word, fellow members of the Israelitish commonwealth, a provision which was, according to the common understanding of that passage, duly made.

*Michaelis (Mosaishes Racht) assumes that the law, in prescribing the liberation of the slave in the seventh year had based that provision upon a custom which prevailed already among the patriarchs and their dependents, inasmuch as Jacob had twice served with Laban, and each time for seven years. In the case of Jacob, however, the term of service is seven years, whilst the law prescribes only six. It is true that in a reference to the Mosaic law which we find in Jerem. xxxiv, 14, the expression מקץ שבע שנים תשלחו ["*At the end of seven years let ye go,*"] occurs but the wards ועבדך שש שנים ["*and when he hath served thee six years*"], which are immediatety subjoined, plainly show that "*seven years*" is here to be taken as a whole, so that we must translate with Philippson: "At the end of a septennium" [or period of seven years], that is, in the seventh year; for the beginning of the last year for a period consisting of several years may be appropriately designated as the end of that period. Cf. Nachmanides and Abarbanel on Deut. xv, 1.

ter and the slave in mind of the sovereignty of God, whose servants both of them were. In Levit. xxv, 42, this commemorative character of the emancipation connected with the year of jubilee is expressly mentioned. And besides, the emancipation is, in that passage, distinctly connected with the other injunctions regarding the year of jubilee, the design of which obviously was, to restore the original equality of all the members of the Israelitish commonwealth as regards both property and liberty.

§ 6.

c. *Extraordinary cases, in which the Slave obtained his liberty.*

There were other circumstances, besides the seventh year of servitude and the year of jubilee, in which, as the Rabbins affirm, the Hebrew slave could obtain his liberty. These were:

1. By restoring the purchase money, for which he had not yet rendered adequate service. For so soon as the bondman, during his term of service, came, by inheritance or otherwise, into the possession of property, and was thus enabled thereafter to maintain himself from his own resources, as well as to render the required restitution for the theft which he had committed, he could immediately obtain his liberty, even though his master was not willing, by restoring to him the money which he had paid for him, after deducting as much as would afford him suitable wages for such time as he had already been in servitude. Kiduschin 146, Maimon. Abad. II, §8.

2. By his master voluntarily bestowing upon him a certificate of emancipation, in which he renounced all claim to the further services of that slave and to the restoration of the purchase money. Maimon. ibid, §11.

3. By the master's death occurring before the term of service expired, without his leaving a son to inherit his property; for the Hebrew servant was under no obligation to serve out his time to any other heir of his deceased master, except only his son. Maimon. ibid, §12.

§ 7.

d. *Slavery prolonged beyond the legal term by the boring of the ear.*

If the Hebrew slave, from attachment to his master, or to one of his female slaves, with whom he had lived in wedlock, or to the children whom he had had by her, did not wish to make use of his liberty, to which he was entitled at the expiration of his six year's term of service, the law allowed him, indeed, to remain in bondage, but, in order to guard against any abuse of this privilege, and perhaps also by way of punishment for the rejection of the liberty that was offered, ordained as follows:*

The slave was to be, first of all, brought before the judges, that he might declare his intention in their presence. It was probably their duty to direct his attention to the consequences of his purpose, and to satisfy themselves that this had not been lightly adopted, or in any way forced upon him by his master. If the slave persisted in his determination, he was to receive, in an exposed, but at the same time the least sensitive part of his person, a mark as a perpetual memorial of his resolution; and for this purpose, the boring of the ear, which was also among other nations a sign of servitude, was peculiarly adapted.† The master himself performed the

*Exod. XXI, 5, 6: Deut. XV, 16, 17.

†As a mark of bondage the piercing of the ear is mentioned with reference to the Mesopotamians (Juven. I, 104), the Arabs (Petron. sat. 102), and the Lydians (Xenoph. Anab. III, 1, 31). According to Knobel (Exod. p. 214), the mark denotes that he who wears it has hearing ears, and is therefore to be attentive and obedient. Cf. Ps. XL, 6. It is met with also among other nations, without being exactly a mark of bondage, but merely as a sign that the person belongs, in a general way, or is devoted, to some other, e. g., as a mark of those who belong to some saint and are his devotees. Cf. Rosenmüller, Morgenland, II, p. 70, sq. Knobel conjectures that in the passage above cited from Exodus the *right* ear is meant, which had the preference in certain acts of purification and consecration. The same thing is affirmed, and for the same reason, by the Talmudists (Kiduschin, 15, a.), The latter, who regard this boring of the ear as exclusively a *punishment* for the rejection of liberty, suggests the following ingenious explanation of the subjection of the ear to this process. Why is it the ear that is selected for punishment? Because with ear the man has heard the words: "I am thy God, who hath delivered thee from Egypt," and yet has afterwards gone and made himself, a being whom God had made free, the slave of a man; and therefore shall the punishment be inflicted upon his ear. In like manner they represent the door post, against which the ear was bored, as a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt. (Ibid, fol. 22, 6).

process of boring, and this he was to do by boring with an awl the ear of the slave against the door post of his house,* whereby, on the one hand, the transaction was made more public, but, on the other hand, also, it was symbolically intimated to the slave, that, whereas he was already *standing on the threshold of liberty*, he now remained, by his own resolution, *bound, as a slave, to that house.* The disgrace and degradation connected with the whole of this transaction, and with the indelible mark of bondage which the slave was thus perpetually to bear at his ear, must, if the last spark of self-respect had not become extinct within him, have deterred the slave from consenting to such a prolongation of the legal term of his bondage; and this was probably all that the law designed to effect by that ordinance.†

The Rabbins call a slave whose ear has thus been bored, נרצע, "one who has been bored."

According to the natural signification of the expression, ועבדו לעולם "*And he shall serve him forever*" (Exod. XXI, 6), as well as of this other, והיה לך עבד עולם "*and he shall be thy servant forever*" (Deut. XV, 17), the slave who had received that mark, remained, to the end of his life in the service of his master. In this sense the passages are understood by most of the more recent exegetical commentators of the Scriptures. The Rabbinical tradition,‡ on the contrary, and also Josephus|| understand לעולם ("for ever") to mean "till the time of the year of jubilee," so that the slave who had had

*That this boring was to take place, not only *at* the door, but also *against* it, [*unto it*], is plain from Deut. xv, 17. Ibn Esra and Abarbanel understand by הדלת [the door] the city gate, where the judges sat. But then the proper word would be השער and not הדלת. And besides, when this law is repeated in Deut. xv, 17, there is no mention whatever of the judges, whence in that place the gate of justice is not at all to be thought of in connection with בדלה. Ewald (Antiquities, p. 245) understands by הדלת "*the door of the sanctuary* (because he considers האלהים ["the judges" to signify a *supreme court* composed of priests, presided over by the high priest and holding its sessions in the sanctuary). In that case, however, both master and slave would have been obliged first to make a pilgrimage to the sanctuary, and this is scarcely implied in והגישו [and he [his master, אדניו] shall bring him].

†It is probable that this ordinance was never carried into effect; at any rate this was scarcely practicable, if all the numberless conditions which tradition (Kiduschin 22 a. u. Mechiltha and Siphri) represents as indispensable to the execution of it had really to be observed.

‡Kiduschin fol. 14 and 15.

||Antiquities IV, 8, 28: ἕως ἰωβήλ.

his ear bored recovered his liberty at all events in the year of jubilee, forasmuch as, according to Levit. xxv, 10, that year was to restore liberty to all the Hebrew inhabitants of the land.*

According to the views of the Talmudists, the slave who had had his ear bored was to obtain his liberty, not only in the year of jubilee, but also at the death of his master, since he could be inherited neither by the son nor by any other relative.†

*In order to vindicate the correctness of the traditional rendering Ibn Esra observes that עולם frequently denotes only *a period of time.* To the argument in favor of this which he derives from Eccles. i, 10. כבר היה לעולמים ["it hath been already of old time"), and from 1 Sam. i, 22, ויּשׁב שם עד עולם ]"and there abide for ever"]. Munk (Palestine, p. 141) adds another still more striking from Is. xxxii, 14 and 15, where upon עד עולם (in aeternum) a limiting עד (donec) follows. But as time was, among the Israelites, divided into jubilee-cycles, the opening upon a new jubilee-cycle could be appropriately designated by עולם. In connection with Exod. xxi, 6, Philippson makes the remark, that the word עולם "has been chosen in this place only because the year of jubilee was instituted at a later period." But when he alleges this reason, the question still remains, why a similar expression is afterwards again employed in Deut. xv, 17, subsequently to the institution of the year of jubilee. To the traditional interpretation of the passage Saalschütz (d. Mos. Recht, 699) urges this among other objections: "I cannot comprehend how the year of jubilee should, without any intimation of this sort from the legislator, bestow upon the slave the right previously denied him, to take with him the bondwoman who belonged to the master, and also her children; and without this, emancipation would surely have had no attractions for him." Another objection is made by Knobel, Exod. p. 214, "the declaration of the slave that he does not wish to become free shows, that in this case perpetual bondage is meant." But there is here one thing to be considered, which bears forcibly against these two objections, and that is, that in the year of Jubilee every Israelite was to be repossessed of his paternal estate [possession] which he had sold. In possession of this now unincumbered paternal estate the man who had hitherto been a slave could not possibly be willing any longer to forego his liberty, which in times past he had relinquished solely under the pressure of circumstances; and what is more, he was, by thus recovering his property, in most instances enabled to purchase the freedom of the bondwoman with whom he had lived in contubernio, and that of the children whom she had borne him. And that all this is really assumed by the law is plain from this circumstance alone, that with reference to the year of jubilee it does not at all take into account, as it does in its provisions for emancipation at the end of a six year's servitude, the contingency of any slave, not desiring to avail himself of the liberty to which he had a legal claim.

†The Talmud (Kiduschin 17, 6,) deduces this rule from literal explanation of the suffix in ועבדו "*let him serve him,*" *him*, the master only but not an heir לו ולא לורשיו.

§ 8.

e. *Position and Treatment of the Hebrew Slave during his bondage.*

By restricting the duration of servitude to a term of years the Mosaic law has repudiated the principle of slavery and converted the sale of a Hebrew into a mere hiring out of the man for a limited time, but, in accordance with this, it actually requires in so many words, that his condition is simply to be that of a hired servant, and that, as such, he is to be treated with kindness and with all due consideration (Levit. XXV, 40, 42, 43.)

It was only the time and the strength to labor of the purchased Israelite that belonged, during the term of servitude, to the master, not, however, his *person* or his *property*. And accordingly the master had no right to transfer his Hebrew servant to any other person, either by selling or giving him away.* If the servant was married when his term of service commenced, the master had no claim whatever to the services of either his wife or children, although he was under obligations to provide for their support.† Nor could the master lay claim to any thing which the servant, during his term of servitude, might happen to find or to acquire in any other way than by his labor.‡

As regards the work to be done by the servant, the master could require such only at his hands, as he had been accustomed to, whilst he was free. He had no right, under any circumstances, to compel him to perform any of those menial duties which were obligatory exclusively upon real slaves: such e. g., as, attending the master to the bath, and carrying his garments, tying or unfastening his sandals, washing him, anointing him, or carrying him in a sedan-chair.§ Whilst he

*Maim. Abad. IV, 10.

†Kiduschin 22 and Maim. Ibid, III, 1, 2.

‡Mischna Babamezia, I, 5.

§All these specifications are based upon the injunction of the law, in Levit. XXV, 39, עבדת עבד לא תעבור בו, "thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant." It is interesting here to note that those menial services, mentioned above, could be legitimately required of a *free* Israelite, who, had hired himself out as a day laborer; and this is accounted for by the Rabbins on the ground, that such a one had, of his own accord, consented to do such work, whereas the purchased servant has less opportunity of exercising his free will, and is therefore more liable to be humiliated by such degrading services.

was employed in such labor as he might be legally required to do, the servant's physical abilities were to be duly considered, and he was to be allowed the necessary rest and recreation.* Although the servant was bound to be always obedient and submissive to his master, the latter was not allowed to make him feel his dependent condition, to chastise him, or to hurt his feelings with harsh words, but was always to treat him with friendliness and fraternal kindness.† If he had injured him by means of a blow, the servant was entitled to the same indemnification, which the law provides for an injury done to a free citizen.‡ The food, clothing and dwelling to which the servant was entitled, were to correspond with the pecuniary circumstances of the master.§

In one particular only the Hebrew servant was the same as that of the real slave, not belonging to the Hebrew commonwealth; and this was, that, according to Exod. XXI, 4, the master could give him one of his female slaves|| to wife for the whole term of his servitude. This union was not regarded as a civil marriage sanctioned by religion (קידושין [Kid-

*Maim. Ibid, I, 6.

†Ibid, §9.

‡Mischna Baba Kama VIII, 3. The Rabbins justly regard the provisions of the law in Exod. XXI, 26, 27, as having reference only to non-Hebrew slaves, as the Hebrew servant became free at any rate after the sixth year of service, or at the year of jubilee, so that his immediate emancipation would have afforded no adequate indemnification for any serious injury that he might have sustained.

§The Rabbins, in their exposition of the law, go, we presume, too far, when they say, that under no circumstances were the food, clothing and dwelling of the servant to be inferior to those of the master; whence the proverb arose: עברי כקונה אדון לעצמו כל הקונה עבד "he that has bought a Hebrew slave, has, as it were, bought himself a master. "Kiduschin, 22.

||The Rabbins rightly assume, that a bondwoman from among a heathen people is here meant; for the Hebrew maid-servant became free, as well as the man-servant, after the sixth year of service, so that it could not be said of her, "the wife and her children shall be her masters." Salvador (Histoire des Institutum de Moise, livre VII, ch. v), and also Bertheau (Sieben Gruppen mos. Gesetz, p. 22), are of opinion, that reference is here had to a Hebrew bondwoman, who had entered into servitude later than the bondman, so that, at the time when the latter obtained his liberty, she would still have to remain with the master, until she had served out her six years. But then, what interest could the master have had in giving his Hebrew servant such a female slave as a contubernalis, if he had been obliged to set her, together with her children, at liberty, in the course of a few years, before he could derive any profit from these children? For that, in such a case, the children would have to go with the mother when the latter recovered her liberty, cannot be doubted.

uschin]), but only as *contubernium* (Kiduschin 68), and the children who were born in a union of this kind belonged, as "born in the house," to the master, and no more went with the bondman when he became free, than did the mother.*

## § 9.

### f. *The Gift at Parting.*

ענקה

At the time of his emancipation after his six years' term of service, and also, as the Rabbins teach, when he obtained his liberty in the year of jubilee, the Hebrew servant was not to be permitted by his master to go away empty, but the latter was to bestow upon him a bountiful gift in sheep, grain and wine. (Deut. xv, 13, 14). The extent of this gift is not defined by the law, but was to depend upon the pecuniary circumstances and the good will of the master; the Rabbins, however, state the minimum value at thirty shekels, (Kiduschin 17). This emancipation-present had, obviously, a two-fold design. It was to furnish the emancipated slave the means of again establishing his own household, that he might not be compelled by want immediately to sell that liberty again which he had just recovered, so that, as the Talmudists declare,† the creditors of the slave could not make good any alleged claim to this emancipation-present. But

*Michaelis (Mos. Recht. §127, Note) has propounded the question, whether these children of a father who was, at the time, a slave, did not, at all events, according to Levit. xxv, 41, obtain their liberty in the year of jubilee. But whilst he does not venture to express himself positively upon this subjeet, Philippson (die Israelit. Bibel. pp. 424 and 425) assumes the emancipation of these children in the year of jubilee as a matter of course. Even Josephus is perhaps of the same opinion; he says (Antiqq. iv, 8, 28) of the slave who was living in contubernio, that he obtained his liberty in the year of jubilee, and adds: *καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα ἐλευθέραν επαγόμενος*, ["taking away with him his children and his wife, they also to be free"]. In decided opposition to these opinions are the views of the Talmudists (Kiduschin 68 and 69), according to whom such children are to be regarded as absolute slaves, inasmuch as they shared the condition of the mother (ולדיה כמיתה), whereas by the children referred to in Levit. xxv, 41, who went with the father when he became free, those only could be meant whom a *free* woman, his wife, had borne him, and who had become slaves at the same time with himself. And it is perhaps to these children only that the words of Josephus have reference, especially as he mentions, besides the children *τὴν γυναίκα* ["the wife"] also, by which term he is not likely to designate the bondwoman spoken of above.

†Kiduschin fol. 16б: לו ולא לבעל חובו.

as the slave was not to be compelled, by severity, to perform his duties, this gift was doubtless also designed to stimulate him to exert himself, during his term of service, to deserve the entire satisfaction of his master, as upon the degree to which the latter was satisfied with him, depended the amount of that gift.*

§ 10.

g. *An ancient Custom connected with the Discharge of the Slave in the Year of Jubilee.*

Whilst the slave's discharge from bondage after his six years' term of service, which took place, of course, in respect of individual slaves, at different times respectively as their terms of servitude had commenced, proceeded quietly and without any particular formalities, it is natural that with the general emancipation of all Hebrew slaves in the year of jubilee certain solemnities and formalities should be connected. With regard to this the law itself prescribed that at the beginning of the year of jubilee, on the *tenth* day of the seventh month, the restoration to liberty of all Israelites living in servitude should be proclaimed, with the sound of the trumpet, throughout the land (Levit. xxv, 9, 10). Tradition makes mention of an ancient custom, according to which slaves were discharged from their servile relations as early as on the first day of the above mentioned month, without, however, being as yet dismissed to their homes. During the interim they united in celebrating, in joyous banquets and entertainments, the termination of the servitude, on which occasions they wore garlands on their heads. And when, on

*Those of the Talmudic doctors who, as was observed above (note to §5), regard the six years' term of service, and hence also the boring of the ear when the term was to be prolonged, as well the cohabitation with one of the master's Canaanitish bondwomen, as referring only to the slave who had been sold on account of theft, hold, as consistency requires them to do, that the law prescribing the parting gift, applies, in like manner, only to this slave, whilst the voluntary slave could advance no claim to such a present. They may have been led to this view of the subject by the consideration, that the voluntary slave would be able, after recovering his freedom, to employ the purchase-money paid for him in the re-establishment of his own independent household, whereas in the case of the other slave the purchase-money was appropriated as an indemnity for the theft which he had committed. We have shown above, however (note to §5), that the opposite view held by Rabbi Eliesar, who denies that any difference whatever existed between the voluntary slave and the slave sold on account of theft, is more probably correct.

the day of atonement, the trumpet sounded, they returned to their possessions and their families.*

## II. *The Hebrew Servant in the Service of a Master who was not a Hebrew.*

### § 11.

In cases of necessity the law (Levit. xxv, 47–55) even allowed the Israelite to sell himself to a man not a Hebrew, provided that he lived in the country and was subject to the laws of the land.† In the service of such a master, however, the Hebrew servant could not claim, either his liberty at the end of the sixth year of service, or the gift bestowed on others at their discharge. For this reason already the Israelite, who was compelled by circumstances to accept a state of bondage, must have preferred to sell himself, if possible, to a member of the Hebrew commonwealth, from whom, at any rate, he could in general expect more considerate treatment. But in the year of jubilee even the slave of one, not a Hebrew, obtained his freedom. But as, during so protracted a term of service in the house of a heathen master the religious faith and the moral character of an Israelitish servant was exposed to danger,‡ the law determined in his favor not only that he should, in case he had acquired property in the mean time, have the privilege of purchasing his own freedom, but also that near or distant relatives should be permitted to release him from his servitude by paying the required ransom [*Vide infra*]. But in order that the master might neither, by exorbitant demands, throw obstacles in the way of such a redemption or render it utterly impossible, nor suffer in his own rights and interests by the discharge of the slave being demanded for an inadequate ransom,§ the law expressly requires, that the amount of the price of redemption shall be strickly proportionate to the purchase-money and determine according to the number of the years of service

*Talm. Roschhaschana fol. 8 b:
מלה עד יהב לא היו עברים נפטרין לבתיהו ולא משתעבדין לארונוהו
אלא אוכלין ושותין ושמחין ועטרותיהן בראשיהן כשהגיע יהב תקעו בד בשופר
נפטרו עבדים לבתיהן:

†Cf. Kid. 16: אין הכהן מדבר אלא בנכרי שישנו תחת ידיך

‡Cf. Kid. 26 b. גאולה תהיה כוכי היכי דלא ליטמע ביו הנכרים

§Cf. Raschi on Levit. xxv, 48. בגוי שתחת ידיך הכתוב מדבר יאעפ כז
לא תבא בעקיפיו - אלא ידקדק בחשבון:

already expired. Thus, for example, if a man who had sold himself ten years before the year of jubilee for forty shekels, was to be redeemed after three years of his term of service had expired, then the price of redemption amounted, after twelve shekels had been deducted for the time that he had served, to twenty-eight shekels.

The kinsman who redeemed a slave in this way, did not, by so doing, acquire any claim to the service of the person redeemed. On the contrary such redemption was looked upon as a duty obligatory upon a man's relatives, a duty which they could, under certain circumstances, be even compelled to perform.*

The position of the Hebrew servant in the house of a master who was not an Israelite did not essentially differ from that in the house of a fellow-countryman. He was to be regarded as only a hired servant, and to be treated as such with all kindness. As respects the *Hebrew* master, it was only necessary to make this kind treatment dependent upon the dictation of his own conscience: "thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God (Levit, xxv, 43); with reference to the heathen master, on the contrary, it is said (ib. v. 53): he "shall not rule with rigor over him *in thy sight*," which words, as explained by the Rabbins, ordain, that the *magistrates* are to see to this kind treatment. The interference of the magistrates was admissible, however, only when the master's rigor and want of consideration were *clearly manifest*.†

## B. *The Hebrew Maid-servant.*

אמה עבריה

### § 12.

With reference to the bondwoman the Mosaic law displays even a much more tender solicitude than in the case of the Hebrew bondman. Besides the indulgent consideration which it constantly exhibits in view of the depressing circumstances connected with the dependent condition and the loss of liberty of any human being, there was, in the case of the female slave, this additional circumstance to consider, that in a state of servitude a maiden's virtue was more than ordinarily exposed to temptations and to the wiles of seducers.

*Maimonid. Abadim II, 7.

†Maimon Abadim, I, 6.

This was especially the case, if a maiden had, at a tender age, been sold by her father because of his poverty,* her budding youth and her weakness and inexperience aggravated the dangers which threatened her virtue. That this might be protected and removed from danger, the law provides that the master, when purchasing such a maiden, tacitly assumes the obligation to marry her when she has arrived at the age of puberty, or, at the least, to take her as his concubine. It is, as a general thing, inconceivable that any father could, except solely in view of such an arrangement, be induced by his destitute condition to sell his daughter. Viewed in this light the particular specifications in Exod. XXI, 7–11, become perfectly clear, as the following considerations will show:

If the master manifested a willingness to fulfil the tacitly assumed obligation, the maiden was not to go out free, "*as the men-servants do*," i. e., after the sixth year of service or in the year of jubilee, as she was no longer to be regarded as a common maidservant, but rather, in a certain sense, as the *betrothed* of the master (v. 7). But if the master showed by his conduct, that it was not his intention to marry her or to make her his concubine, he was to concede to her father or to some other member of her family the privilege of immediately redeeming her,† and, as the Rabbins affirm, to facilitate her redemption by not demanding full restitution of the purchase money, and by deducting from this the amount that was covered by the services already rendered.‡ But the deceitful master had no right to sell her to a stranger to be either his maidservant or his concubine (v. 8).

If he did not wish to marry her himself, it was only to his own son that he could give her to wife. In this case, however, he was to "*deal with her after the manner of daughters*," i. e., he was to give her the same dowry as if she were

*Only at a tender age (whilst she was still קטנה ["little"]), a maiden could be sold by her father against her will. When she had arrived at the age of puberty his paternal authority over her ceased, and could be exercised only in a sort of surveillance over her until she was married.

†This is the most natural sense of והפדה, which has in the Hiphil form a causative signification, to permit to be redeemed. To us it is quite incomprehensible how Ewald (p. 246, note) can claim for the Hiphil form of פדה [to set free] without any authority whatever, the signification "*to marry*, i. e., to take as concubine," so that והפדה [let her be redeemed] would be only a tautology of יעדה [hath betrothed her] and still belong to the connecting clause.

‡Kiduschin 14, b: והפדה מלמד שמגרע פדיונה יצבה

his own daughter and the son was to treat her as he would any free woman who had become his wife.

But if either the master or his son who had married her took, besides her, another wife of the same description, the first one was not to suffer, in consequence, any diminution of her rights, for he was not allowed to diminish her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage (v. 10).

But if, when she had arrived at the age of puberty, the master refused either to marry her himself, or to give her to his son, or to effect her redemption, she obtained her liberty at once, without money, and without waiting for the seventh year of service, or the year of jubilee.*

Without the consent of the maiden neither the master nor his son could take her to wife. But when such a marriage was contracted the marriage gift [made the morning after the consummation of the marriage] customary in other cases was not required, for the reason that the purchase-money, paid to the maiden's father, was regarded as such. In all other respects this sort of marriage was just as much legally binding and just as sacred as the ordinary marriage, and could, like this, be dissolved only by the husband's death or by a bill of divorce.†

Of course, however, instances might occur, in which the elevation of the purchased maidservant to the position of the master's or the son's wife was at all events, out of the question, and in which, moreover, all apprehensions of any dangers threatening her virtue were needless; as, for example, when a Hebrew woman who was no longer young sold herself, in consequence of her destitution, as a servant of all work. In

*So the Rabbins understand v. 11, vid. Raschi on this verse: Cf. also Maimonides Abad IV, 9. Others (Rosenmüller, Philippson, Ewald, etc.) refer שלש אלה to the three things mentioned in the preceding verse: שארה כסותה ועונתה which seems, however, less suitable, as it is scarcely proper to say: עשה כסותה or עשה שארה and the like, so that, in the place of לא יעשה לה one ought rather to look for יגרע לה or לא יתן לה. In this verse, moreover, the presumption is no longer admissible, that either the master or his son had really taken the maiden to wife, since this event would as a matter of course, have already terminated her state of bondage; upon which supposition, therefore, the words ויצאה חנם אין כסף ["and she shall go out free without money"] would now be quite inappropriate.

†Maimonid. Abad. IV, 7 and 10. It may be that Gideon's union with the mother of Abimelech affords an historical instance of such a marriage, whence the latter is designated, at one time as פלגש (Judges VIII, 31) ["concubine"], at another, with reference to her former rank, by way of contempt, as אמה (ibid 9, 18,) ["maid-servant"].

this case the maidservant was (according to Deut. xv, 12, 17) put on the same footing with the Hebrew man-servant as regards the time for the restoration to liberty, and the gift to be received at the time of parting.*

According to tradition, a Hebrew woman was never sold into slavery on account of a theft she had committed.† The ordinance respecting the boring of the ear for the purpose of prolonging the term of service had also, according to the opinion of the Rabbins, no application to the Hebrew maidservant.‡ As the Hebrew maidservant could form no matrimonial union with a slave, there existed, as a general thing, no reason why she should have her term of service prolonged beyond the period fixed by the law. In her case, moreover, a pierced ear could not be a disgraceful mark of slavery, for in ancient times also the female sex had, as a rule, the ears bored for the purpose of inserting ear ornaments.

*This statement enables us to reconcile, in the most natural manner, the seeming contradiction between Exod. xxi, 7, and Deut. xv, 12, 17. For the former passage refers to the special case of a father selling his daughter as a maid servant, which took place, as a general thing, only on the presumption that the master would either take her himself, or give her to his son, to wife. The passage in Deuteronomy, on the contrary, has reference to the purchase of a Hebrew woman as a common maid of all work, in which case there was no such presumption, Cf. Hengstenberg, the authenticity of the Pentateuch ii, p. 438, sq. That Hebrew women were actually employed in the sole capacity of working slaves, appears from Jerem. xxxiv, 9–12. The Mischna likewise seems evidently to take it for granted in several places (Babamezia i, 5; Erubin vii, 6; Maasar scheni iv, 4, in which last passage the use of שפחה instead of the more usual term אמה must not be overlooked) that Hebrew women who had come of age could also be held as servants. Quite a different view, however, is taken of this subject by the Gemara (Babamezia 12, b, Gittin 64, b.), according to which a Hebrew maidservant could only be a maiden still in her minority, who had been sold by her father, and who, in case the master had not married her, became free, under any circumstances whatever, as soon as she had arrived at the age of puberty.

†Mischna Sota iii, 8; Cf. also Maimonid. Abad i, 2.

‡Kiduschin 17 b; Cf. also Maimonid. iii, 13. Philippson, who in general shows a due respect for the traditional acceptation, maintains, in opposition to it (p. 424), that the Hebrew maiden could, by having her ear bored in public, remain longer in service; and he endeavors to support this view by an appeal to Deut. xv, 17. The traditional view, however, refers, in that place, the words ואף לאמתך תעשה־כן ["and also unto thy maidservant thou shalt do likewise"] to verse 13, and thus considers verses 16 and 17 down to עולם [for ever] as a parenthesis. This acceptation of the passage under consideration is, as it appears to us, sustained by the following verse (v. 8), which quite obviously refers back, in like manner, to verse 13.

And lastly, it may have been looked upon as irreconcilable with a sense of propriety, to permit an operation so public and degrading to be performed upon the person of a woman.

*The final Abrogation of Slavery as respects Members of the Hebrew Commonwealth.*

§ 13

It cannot be accurately determined, how long and to what extent the laws of Moses regarding the condition of slaves who belonged to the Jewish commonwealth were actually carried into effect. That slaves received, upon the whole, that kind treatment and those favors which the law claimed for them, we may safely infer from the silence of the prophets, as these guardians and defenders of all who were oppressed or suffered wrong would, of a certainty, not have failed to rebuke any open offences against those provisions of the law. Only the ordinance respecting the emancipation at the end of the sixth year of service had, as we learn from the prophet Jeremiah XXXIV, 14), toward the end of the old Jewish monarchy, for a long time already fallen entirely into disuse. Nor is it difficult to account for the disregard of this particular ordinance. With a tender consideration for certain relations the law itself had allowed the term of service to be prolonged beyond the period of six years.

It is natural, that the richer Hebrews found it to their interest to make an extended use of this concession, and to induce their Hebrew servants by alluring promises to consent to the prolongation of their term of service. The notice to the judges which the law prescribed, and which was specially designed to prevent this abuse, was probably omitted in most cases, as the master had reason to apprehend that the slave would permit himself to be deterred by the representations of the judges and by the boring of his ear to which the law required him to submit, from persisting in his purpose. In this way the law of Moses, which restricted the servitude of a Hebrew to a term of six years, fell gradually so completely into oblivion, that servants were, even against their will, retained in bondage, because the opinion had come to be entertained, that masters had a justly acquired right to the unlimited services of persons whom they had once bought as slaves. Even in the political reform which was undertaken, in the spirit of the Mosaic law, by the pious king Josiah,

the reintroduction of the ordinance relating to the liberation of slaves after a servitude of six years seems not to have been undertaken, as it was to be presumed that an attempt of this kind would lead to no permanent results. It must, however, have appeared proportionally easier and at all events, more in accordance with the spirit of the Mosaic legislation, rather to abolish slavery, as regards members of the Hebrew commonwealth, entirely, and to introduce labor for wages, or the plan of employing day laborers, in its place. An attempt of this kind seems to have been actually made even before the downfall of the old Jewish monarchy. For at the time when Nebuchadnezzar began the seige of Jerusalem, king Zedekiah proposed, probably upon representations of the prophet Jeremiah, at a popular assembly convened in the temple for the purpose of determining upon a day of humiliation and prayer in view of the impending danger, that every man should let his Hebrew slave and his Hebrew bondwoman go free, and that no man should thereafter hold in bondage a fellow countryman and fellow believers.*

Both the princes and the people assented to the proposed measure, and the resolution which was adopted by a solemn ceremony was immediately carried into effect. But scarcely was the threatened danger supposed to have passed away, when the rich and powerful repented of what they had done, and again reduced their emancipated slaves by force under the yoke of bondage. It was not until the complete overthrow of the ancient monarchy, emphatically predicted anew by the prophet in consequence of this breach of faith, that the slavery of fellow members of the Hebrew commonwealth really came to an end. An attempt, which was made after the return from the Babylonish captivity, to introduce it

*Vid. Jerem. XXXIV, 8, sqq. The assumption that this emancipation was nothing more than a measure dictated by danger, "so that the number of combatants might be increased in the same manner as it was occasionally done among other nations, by means of emancipated slaves," is sufficiently confuted by the circumstance, that the emancipation was to embrace also the *bondwomen*, whom it was scarcely intended to employ as soldiers. The solemn manner in which the King's proposition was sanctioned at the temple (vv. 15, 18 and 19) indicates on the contrary, that the emancipation was to be an expiatory measure to avert the divine wrath provoked by the enslavment of Hebrew citizens. That the proposition aimed at the *perpetual* abolition of the slavery of Hebrew citizens seems to be expressed by the emphatic words: אחיהו איש לבלתי עבדו־בם ביהדי ["that none should serve himself of them, i. e., of a Jew his brother"] v. 9, and לבלתי עד־בם עוד ["that none should serve themselves of them any more"] v. 10.

again, was energetically crushed by Nehemiah (Nehem. v, 5–10). After that there were in the re-established Jewish commonwealth none but *non-Hebrew* or *heathen slaves*, of whose condition we shall speak in the next following section. Such slaves were held, under the same circumstances, by the Jews who dwelt in Palestine and other oriental countries, even after the downfall of the second Jewish monarchy. The privilege of having a Hebrew for a slave was regarded as having ceased of course, with the disappearance of the celebration of the year of jubilee, i. e., about the time of the destruction of the first monarchy.* From this time forward, therefore, fellow-countrymen could only be hired as free workmen, day-laborers, waiters and house-servants.† We find, indeed, that under the despotic rule of Herod the old law, according to which a Hebrew could be sold for theft, was again introduced; the people, however, appear to have resisted the execution of this ordinance, by refusing to buy such slaves, whence the King caused thieves to be sold into foreign countries; but by this proceeding he only exasperated the people still more.‡

As respects those Hebrews who had, either through war or in any other way, fallen into servitude among heathens, it was at all times regarded as a most sacred duty, resting upon every Hebrew who possessed the means, to ransom them.§

## II. *The Condition of Slaves who were not Hebrews.*

### § 14.

### *Whence were these Slaves usually obtained?*

The real slaves whom it was allowed to hold for life might be obtained, according to the Mosaic law (Levit. xxv, 44–46), partly from among the surrounding nations, partly from among the strangers and foreign settlers in the country, but not from among the Canaanitish peoples who dwelt originally in the land, because these nations, who were immersed in vice and idolatry, were to be utterly extirpated, in order that all temptation might be removed from the immigrating Israelites

*אין עבד עברי נוהג אלא בזמו שהיובל נוהג, Kiduschin 63 and Erachin 29; Cf. also Maimond. Abadim I, 10 and Jobel uschemita x, 8 and 9.

†פעלן, שכיר, שמש, שמעי.

‡Cf. Josephus Antiqq. xvi, 1, 1.

§Nehem. v, 8; Cf. also Baba bathra fol. 8: פדיון שבויים מצוה רבה.

(Cf. Deut. xx, 16–19) But as these nations were *never* actually rooted out of the country, many of them having remained within the dominions of the Israelites (Cf. Judges I, 28, sqq.), it was natural that most of the slaves should, at a later period, be obtained from among these very *Canaanites.* And in this we may find the reason why the Rabbins ordinarily employ the words עבד כנעני "Canaanitish slave," as the designation for any slave who was not a Hebrew.*

§ 15.

*How were such Slaves originally acquired?*

There were three ways in which slaves who were not Hebrews were originally acquired:

1. By *purchase*, i. e., by buying from the nations mentioned above partly slaves of their own, partly prisoners of war, and probably, to some extent also, children who were sold by their parents because of their poverty. This was probably the most common method of obtaining them, and such slaves are in the Scriptures often called מקנת כסף slaves "*bought with money*" [see Gen. XVII, 12, 13, 23, 27], in order to distinguish them from those "born in the house."

2. By *contract*, i. e., when individual strangers, who dwelt in the land and were unable to maintain themselves by free labor, entered voluntarily, either for a specified period of time or for ever, into the state of slavery, in order thus to be relieved from the necessity of caring for their own support.

3. By *conquest in war*,† i. e., when those prisoners of war who were either taken on the field of battle or at the conquest of hostile cities were deprived of their liberty and

*It is possible that with this term the Rabbins also designed to designate the *real, permanent* slave, in contradistinction from the Hebrew servant, *who was not in the proper sense of the word a slave*, so that כנעני is an allusion to Gen. IX, 25, where Canaan is cursed as the "*servant of servants*," i. e., as the meanest of all slaves: vid. Raschi on Kiduschin 22, b:

כל עבדים נרראים על שם כנען משום דכתיב ביה עבד עבדים:

†In the Mischna Kiduschni I, 3, the three modes of obtaining Canaanitish slaves are designated by the words: בכסף בשטר ובחזקה, which may be regarded as corresponding with three methods of obtaining them described above as *purchase, contract.*, and *conquest in war.* In reality, however, the Mischna, at the place referred to, treats, not of the *original* acquisition of slaves, but only of the manner in which, in a transfer of property, the mastership over [or right in] slaves is, just as in the case of other kinds of property, assumed by means either of *money*, or of *contract*, or of *actual appropriation* (i. e., by requirng the services of the slave).

made slaves by the conquerors. Among the Hebrews, however, the number of slaves, especially of male slaves, could not greatly increase in this way, inasmuch as the earliest laws of war (Deut. xx, 10–19) very much restricted the sparing of the lives of prisoners taken in a just war. The *stealing of men by violence* or *kidnapping*, which was a very common method of obtaining slaves among the ancient nations, was regarded by the Hebrews as so heinous a crime, that when the person thus stolen was a fellow-countryman, it was, like murder, punished with death, (Exod. xxi, 16, Deut. xxiv, 7.)

A very considerable increase of the number of slaves was, however, obtained in the children who were born of bondwomen in contubernal unions, and who, as "children of the bondwoman," or as "born in the house," were the serfs of the master. These, were from the earliest times, regarded as the best and most trustworthy, because they had grown up in the family and were familiar with all the affairs of the household, so that their fidelity and attachment could be more certainly reckoned upon, (Gen. xiv, 14).

## § 16.

### *Number and Price of these Slaves.*

In the absence of all definite accounts, it is impossible to ascertain exactly, how great the number of these slaves was, at different times, among the Hebrews. That this number was, at all events, very small in comparison with the vast hosts of slaves among the Greeks and Romans,* may be inferred from divers circumstances. An excess of slaves presupposed, at all times, an extensive traffic in slaves and regular slave-markets. But of neither of these is any trace to be discovered among the Hebrews.†

*Athenæus states the number of slaves in Attica alone to have been 400,000, in Corinth 450,000, and in the small island of Ægina 470,000. In Rome, under the empire, many a rich citizen had alone from 10,000 to 20,000 slaves.

†The Mischna first mentions the sale of slaves in the market. Cf. Baba Kama viii, 1: עבד הנמכר בשוק but even this does not presuppose an extensive Slave trade carried on in markets expressly arranged for this traffic. The expression occurring in the Siphra, upon Levit. xxv, 42, אבן הלרח (Cf. also Maimon. Abad. i, 5), to designate the stone elevation, upon which the slaves to be publicly sold were placed, refers probably only to the practice which is known to have prevailed in Rome at the sale of slaves: cf. the expression, "de lapide emtus," Cic. in Pis. 15.

It is only in the account of the return from the Babylonish captivity that a statement occurs, from which we may derive a proximate estimate af the numerical proportion of the slaves to the free Hebrews. According to Ezra II, 64, 65 and Nehem. VII, 67, there were in the train of the 42, 360 returning exiles 7,337 slaves of both sexes. This gave, on an average, only one slave to every five or six free persons, and as the latter is precisely the avearge number of persons in a family, one slave to each family. It is probable that in the different periods of the Jewish history this was the normal numerical proportion. It is to be presumed that the more wealthy and powerful families employed, at times, a greater number of slaves for, the raising of cattle, the cultivation of the soil, and the different domestic occupations; but then the poorer families often had none at all (Prov. XII, 9), or several families were sometimes satisfied with having one slave in common, who rendered his services to the several families in turn on certain fixed days.* We know that during the time of the second temple no slaves at all were held either by the Essenes or the Therapeutæ; for those sects repudiated every species of slavery as incompatible with the natural equality of all human beings.† The Pharisees also were, from moral considerations, opposed at all events to the holding of many slaves, and reccommended that in domestic service poor Hebrews should be employed rather than slaves.‡

The price of slaves was, of course, different at different times, and was, moreover, conformed to the age, sex, health, strength, capacities and skill of individual slaves. We learn from Exod. XXI, 32, where the restitution to be made for a slave who had been killed by an unruly ox, that the average price of a common laboring slave of either sex amounted to thirty shekels. If, as many suppose, the normal price of slaves was really made the basis of the census recorded in Levit. XXVII, 1–8, then this price varied, according to the sex and age of the slave, from five shekels to fifty, and so that slaves brought the highest price between the ages of twenty and sixty, whilst female slaves brought less than male slaves. With reference to the later times of the Jewish

*Cf. the case repeatedly considered in the Talmudic law: של שני שותפין עבד

†Philo Opp. editio Mangey. II, 458 and 482.

‡Vide Mischna Aboth II, 8, and I, 5; Cf. also Babamezia 60 b.

commonwealth Josephus* reports the ransom paid for an Israelitish captive at 120 drachmæ [about $21,18], which was probably at that time the average value of a slave. As the value of the shekel was, in later times, equal to 4 Attic drachmæ [i. e., a little over 68 cents],† we would thus again have the sum of thirty shekels, only that these shekels exceeded those of the days of Moses in weight.

## § 17.

### d. *The Legal Position of Slaves.*

Although the position, which the law of Moses gave the heathen slave, was essentially different from that of the Hebrew servant, as the latter was to belong to the master only for a fixed period of time, and was to be regarded by him only as a hired servant, whilst the former could be held as property *in perpetuo*, and transmitted, as such, to heirs (Levit. XXV, 46), this position was, nevertheless, far more favorable than with any other nation of antiquity. It is well known that among the other nations the slave was, in the eye of the law, nothing more than a chattel, devoid of all personality, so that the master might do with him what he pleased, and even put him to death ;‡ among the Hebrews, on the contrary, the slave was regarded as being indeed the property of the master ; not, however, as a *chattel* but as a *person*. The fact is that he was only in so far regarded as property, that the master could, as his purchaser, claim the benefit of all his capacity for producing and getting, inasmuch, however, as the slave could never cease to be a *man*, he was looked upon as a *person* possessing certain natural human rights, which even the master could not invade with impunity.

When considered from this point of view the statements both of the Bible and the Rabbins, regarding the legal position of slaves, become perfectly clear. Regarded as the mas-

*Antiqq. XII, 2, 3.

†Antiqq. III, 8, 2.

‡Vide Heineccius Ant. Rom. I. Tit. III, 2, on the subject of Roman slaves: non pro personis, sed pro rebus, immo pro nullis habebantur etc: ["they were regarded, not as persons, but as things, aye, even as not anything at all"]. Cf. also Gai. Inst. I, 52. Apud omnes peræque gentes animadvertere possumus, dominis in servos vitæ necisque protestatem esse. ["We may perceive equally among all nations, that masters have the power of life and death over their slaves."]

ter's property, the slave could again be sold or transmitted to an heir, bestowed as a present or given in pledge* by the master. When viewed as a person, however, his life, his health and soundness of limb constituted an inviolable possession to which the power of the master did not extend. And although therefore the latter could not, by means of corporeal chastisement, force him to labor, he was at liberty to employ milder disciplinary measures. The direct killing of a slave, even when his death was the effect of chastisement with a cane or rod, was to be punished (Exod. XXI, 20), i. e., according to the explanation of the Rabbins, it was to be expiated by the execution of the master. If the death of the slave did not ensue immediately upon the inflicted chastisement, but after several days, so that the chastisement could not be regarded with certainty as the cause of his death, the master was not to be punished, as the loss of his slave was then considered a sufficient punishment (ibid v. 21). But if the master had, in chastising his slave, made use of an instrument which was obviously such as that a blow given with it would prove mortal, the master was punished with death,† although the slave had not died until some length of time after he had received the injury. If a man knocked out an eye or only a tooth of his servant, or inflicted a serious injury on any part of his body, which could then not be restored to its normal condition,‡ the servant obtained his liberty immediately (Exod. XXI, 21, 26, 27).

In so far as the slave was the property of his master, he could earn or acquire nothing for himself. In this respect the principle obtained, "the hand of the slave is the hand of the master,"§ or, "what the slave acquires, he acquires for the master."|| To the master, therefore, belonged, not only whatsoever the slave had acquired by his labor, or found, or received as a present, but he was also entitled to indemnifica-

*The giving of a slave in pledge did not, however, afford the creditor perfect security, as the debtor could give the slave whom he had pledged his liberty: Cf. Mischna Gittin IV, 4.

†Cf. Maimon. "concerning murder," II, 14.

‡Vide Kid: 24, where 24 such parts of the body are specified, such as the ears, fingers, toes, etc.

§יד עבד כיד רבו Babamezia 96. Kiduschin 23 b.

||מה שקנה עבד קנה רבו Pes. 88 b. The Roman law expresses the same principle in almost precisely the same words: Quodcunque per servum acquiritur id domino acquiritur. ["Whatever is acquired by the slave is acquired for the master"] Gai. Inst. I, 52.

tion for injuries which the slave had suffered in his person at the hands of others.

Regarded as a person, the slave was responsible for his own acts. If therefore he had injured other persons, the master was not under legal obligation to make restitution; on the contrary, the restitution which the law prescribed in such cases now rested upon the slave, and he was bound to make it after he had again obtained his liberty.*

In his relation to third persons the criminal law regarded the slave as being on precisely the same footing as the free Israelite. The premeditated murder of a slave was punished with death, whoever slew him unintentionally, was exiled to one of the cities of refuge; and conversely, murder committed by the slave was punished in precisely the same manner†. A third person who either wounded, beat or defamed a slave was liable to the same penalties as if he had inflicted these injuries upon a free Israelite.‡

## § 18.

### e. *The religious and civil Position of the Slave.*

The sacred law [das Religionsgesetz] expressly requires, that the master shall let his non-Hebrew [foreign] slave participate in the three most significant sacred rites of the Israelitish nation:

1. In circumcision, the sign of the covenant. According to this command slaves born in the house were to receive this sign of the covenant on the eighth day after they were born, and purchased slaves, when they entered the service of a Hebrew master.§ Gen. XVII, 10–14; Exod. XII, 44.

*Mischna Baba. Kama VIII, 4; Cf. also Mischna Jedaim IV, 7, and Maim. "Concerning Theft," I, 9.

†Maimon. "Concerning Murder," II, 10–14.

‡Mischna Baba. Kama VIII, 3, Maccoth fol. 9 a; Cf. Maimon. Hilch. Chobel umasik III, 4 and 10. This was different in the Roman law, according to which what was slander or defamation in respect of a free citizen, was not likewise such as regarded a slave. It was also allowed to revile the slaves of others and to strike them with the fist with impunity; Cf. Gai. III, 222. "Si quis servo convicium fecerit, vel pugno eum percusserit, non proponitur ulla formula; nec temere petenti datur." (If any one has gathered a crowd round (mobbed) a slave, or struck him with his fist, there is no mode of proceeding prescribed, nor is there any immediate redress to a plaintiff).

§Saalschütz (das Mos. Recht, p. 704) denies that it was a general rule to circumcise slaves and maintains that it was nothing more than a

2. In the observance of the Sabbath. Both the male and the female slave were, equally with the master, forbidden to labor on the Sabbath, and required to enjoy the rest of that day, Exod. xx, 10; xxiii, 12; Deut. v, 14.

3. In eating the passover, and in the rejoicings connected with the sacrificial rites of the other festivals, Exod. xii, 44; Deut. xii, 18; xvi, 11, 14.

By his participation in these three sacred rites the slave passed out of heathenism and was, in a measure, regarded as a fellow-believer.* He could not, however, be looked upon as a full participant of the religious and national covenant,† because as such he would have ceased to be a real slave. Under no circumstances, could a foreigner enter into the covenant of faith [Glaubensbund] without that perfectly spontaneous and uninfluenced determination of his own mind, which could not be looked for in a slave.

Other religious duties the law of Moses does not expressly enjoin upon the slave. The Rabbins, however, assert, that upon him rested those religious obligations also, which were equally binding upon the female as upon the male sex;‡ and this opinion is based upon the circumstance that, whereas the slave was required to renounce idolatry and all idolatrous practices, the injunction to perform those religious duties afforded him the means of satisfying his religious wants. But how far the Rabbins were from proposing to do violence, in any respect, to the conscience of the slave, appears plainly from their so interpreting the law, that the purchased slave

special obligation laid upon Abraham, and which was no more binding under the Mosaic law. We suggest that this view is contradicted by the expression לדרתכם ["in your generations"] Gen. XVII, 12, and by the words לברית עולם ["for an everlasting covenant"] v. 13. That the Mosaic law should only occasionally mention the circumcision of slaves, as, e. g., in Exod XII, 44, is not surprising, seeing that it presupposes the perpetual obligation of the duty enjoined upon Abraham and his descendants "forever," and that even in respect of the Israelite himself it does not inculcate circumcision otherwise than occasionally, as, for example, in Levit. XII, 3. The Rabbins affirm that in the case of the slave, circircumcision had to be accompanied with baptism. To the latter the purchased bondwoman was also required to submit at the beginning of her term of service, and she thus entered into the same religious relation as the bondman. Cf. Jebamoth 46; Maim. Issure biah XIII, 11.

*אח הוא במצית Baba Kama 88; Sanhedr. 86; Cf. also Maim. "Concerning Murder II, 11, ה שהעבד קבל עליו המיצות וניסף על נחלת

†אינו ראוי לבא בקהל Baba Kama ibid: Cf. also Sanhedrin 58 b. ישראל לא בא

‡כל מצוה שהאשה חייבת בה עבד חייב בה וכו Chayiga 41. Nasir 611. Kerithoth 7.

was not even to be compelled to submit to circumcision, although his receiving that rite was especially commanded by the law. If, therefore, the slave refused to submit to the rite, the master was to wait patiently a whole year, and to endeavor, by kind admonitions, to bring him to a better mind. If, however, his efforts then remained fruitless, he was obliged to sell him again to a heathen. But if the slave had, at the very commencement of his servitude, made the omission of circumcision a condition of his entering the master's service, then the latter was at liberty to keep him, though uncircumcised for ever.* The slave who had once been removed out of heathenism, by means of circumcision could not again be sold to a heathen or into a foreign land, because he might thus be easily led to relapse into heathenism. If the master, nevertheless, sold him, he could, under certain circumstances, be compelled to buy him back again; and in that event he was not allowed to retain him in his service, but had to let him go free.†

Before the magistrates the evidence of a slave was of no value. This arose probably from the unfavorable opinion which was generally entertained respecting the moral character of slaves.‡ The Rabbins, however, recognize in this exclusion only a consequence of the circumstance that, according to Mosaic-Talmudic law, the female sex also was excluded from giving evidence before court, and that hence it was inadmissible to place slaves higher than the female sex, who were full participants in the national and religious covenant of Israel.§

It was not competent for a female slave to enter into the marriage relation under the sanctions of religion and the civil law.‖ If the master permitted a bondman to cohabit with a bondwoman, this connexion was not looked upon, from either a legal or religious point of view, as marriage. Hence the master was at liberty to let the same bondwoman afterwards live in a contubernal union with another slave.¶ But this

*Jebamoth 48 b.

†Gittin 43 b. Maimon Abadim VIII, 1.

‡מרבה עבדים מרבה גזל Aboth II, 7; עבדא בהפקירא ניהא ליה Kethub, II פריצותא משום Pesachim 91.

§Baba Kama 88 בקוח מ־שה וכו Cf. also Maim. "Concerning Evidence," IX, 4.

‖לא תפסי בהו קידושין Jebamoth 45 a; Kiduschin 68.

¶Cf. Maim. Issure biah XIV, 19.

was not done by noble-minded masters, who gave up the bondwoman exclusively to the slave, to whom she had been originally assigned.*

Children who were the fruit of the illicit intercourse of a free man with a bondwoman were held as slaves, and belonged as such to the master of the mother; children, however, whom a bondman had with a free woman were, although esteemed ignoble, regarded as free born; for in such cases the child always shared the condition of the mother.†

The seduction of a maid-servant who had been betrothed to another man,‡ but had not, yet been set quite free, was, according to the law of Moses, punished with scourging, but not, as in the case of a betrothed free maiden, with death. Besides this, the seducer had to atone for his sin by bringing a trespass offering (Levit XIX, 20–22).

### f. *Domestic Condition.*

### § 19.

#### a. *Employment of the Slaves.*

The employments of the slaves differed according to their various abilities and capacities and the wants of their owner. The male slaves were probably employed chiefly in agriculture and the breeding of cattle, the two principal occupations of the nation. In the house they also did the harder work of the household, and waited upon the person of the master at table, in dressing and undressing, washing and anointing him. When the master went into the bath, it was usual for a slave to follow him and to carry his garments. With such personal attendance upon the master, the slave usually began his term of service.§ Slaves were apparently, not much employed in mechanical pursuits, as these were highly esteemed by the Hebrews, and doubtless carried on chiefly by free men. The Rabbins, however, make mention also of

*Cf. Nidda 47: שמואל מייחד להו רב נחמו מחלוף להו

†Maimon. Abad. IX, 1–3; Issure biah XV, 3, 4. The same principle was held by the Roman law: qui nascitur sine legitimo matrimonio, matrem sequitur; "he that is born out of lawful wedlock follows the condition of the mother:" Cf. Gai. I, 82.

‡With reference to the different interpretations of this statute Cf. Talmud Kerith 11 a.

§Cf. Kiduschin 22 b.

slaves employed in trade and in mechanical occupations, such as keepers of public baths, barbers, bakers and the like*

Skilful and trustworthy slaves were not only sometimes employed as overseers of the other slaves and as domestic stewards (Gen. XV, 2; XXIV, 2; 2 Sam. IX, 10), but seem even to have been appointed governors to the sons of the house (Prov. XVII, 2). The female slaves, who were under the immediate authority of the mistress of the family, were expected to render her the same personal services, as the male slaves performed for the master. Besides these, they attended to the female occupations of the house, the principal of which were baking, cooking, grinding, washing and spinning. They were employed as nurses and as maids to take care of children? The hardest labor that female slaves were required to perform consisted in preparing grain for baking, which was done by means of handmills (Job XXXI, 10; Is. XLVII, 2; Cf. also Exod. XI, 5, and Eccles, XII, 3). The lowest position was that of those female slaves, whose duty it was to wait upon the master's male slaves (1 Sam. XXV, 41), and with whom they were made to cohabit. The only out-door work in which maid-servants appear to have been employed was the binding of sheaves (Cf. Ruth II, 8, 9, 23).

§ 20

b. *Treatment of Slaves.*

The enactment of the Mosaic law, which required that both male and female slaves should enjoy a weekly day of rest, was itself sufficient to secure them against being over-tasked with excessive labor. The statute also by which it is enjoined, that animals shall not be tasked beyond their strength, and which, therefore, forbids that animals of unequal strength shall labor together in the same yoke (Deut. XXII, 10) conveyed a forcible appeal for so much the greater consideration to be shown for the physical ability of slaves to labor. Above all, however, the recollection, always cherished among the people, of the heavy burdens borne by them as slaves in Egypt from which divine mercy, in punishing their oppressors, had delivered them, as also the admonitions to

*Cf. Mechiltha on Exod. XXI, 2 and Siphra on Levit. XXV, 39, where it is maintained that it was forbidden to employ Hebrew servants in such money-making pursuits.

deal kindly and mercifully with all strangers and destitute persons, which the divine law reiterated, with direct reference to these reminiscenses, again and again, could not fail to have an important influence upon the treatment of slaves. We can therefore look upon it as certain, that, as a general thing, the condition of slaves was, among the Hebrews far more tolerable and favorable than among any other nation of antiquity. There are even, in the proverbs of Solomon (XXIX, 19, 21) and of Sirach (XXXIII, 25–29), several passages which caution against the excessive indulgence of slaves, especially the younger ones, and which authorize the opinion that most unhappy effects had not been unfrequently experienced in consequence of too great tenderness and indulgence in the treatment of slaves. Disobedient and indolent slaves were, doubtless, sometimes chastised with a cane or rod of correction, and even, in cases of extraordinary contumacy, put in chains (Sirach XXXIII, 29), but the severe penalties mentioned above, as annexed to the killing or serious maiming of a slave, could not fail to tie the hands of a hard-hearted master, and to restrain him from allowing chastisement to degenerate into cruelty. Of the inhuman modes of punishment, which were employed among the Romans for even slight offences,* not a trace can be discovered among the Hebrews.

To the kindness with which slaves were, in general, treated, we must also ascribe the circumstance, that not a single instance of such servile insurrections as were not unfrequent among the Romans and Greeks, is known to have occurred among the Hebrews. Instances even of slaves running away from their masters appear to have been very rare; at all events there is only a solitary case of this kind, that of two of the servants of the violent Shimei (1 Kings II, 39), recorded in the Old Testament.†

If thus the treatment of slaves was, as a general thing, kind and humane, noble-minded masters distinguished themselves pre-eminently in this respect. Thus Job, when reviewing his past life with reference to its moral character, was able to bear witness concerning himself, that he had never despised the cause of his man-servant or his maid-servant, nor had, in general, at any time forgotten, that in the dignity of human nature the slave was his equal (Job XXXI,

*Cf. Becker's Gallus I, 129 sqq.

†From the time of the Talmud several cases are recorded Gittin 45.

13–15). The opulent and highly respected Boaz enters with a truly paternal affability the circle of his *laboring slaves*, and is the first to offer them the salutation: "The Lord be with you" (Ruth II, 4). The Talmud makes frequent mention of distinguished men of later times, and reports that they gave their servants a portion of every dish, of which they themselves partook, and that they even had their food served up to them, before they themselves sat down to their meals;* that they received condolences on account of the death of a faithful slave, like as when a near relation had died, and that they addressed aged slaves with the honorable appellative of *father N.*, or *mother N.*† A distinguished Rabbi, even proposed the general introduction of the practice of chanting publicly at the funerals of virtuous slaves, the customary lament: "Woe! the good. faithful man, productive of good was his activity."‡

In their conduct towards the slaves of others also the Hebrews, in general, observed the duties and performed the kind offices dictated by philanthropy. To calumniate a slave to his master was looked upon as an execrable sin, which God will not leave unpunished (Prov. XXX, 10). Those who were wont in any relation to practice beneficence and mercy, were equally conscientious in practicing them toward slaves,§ and as it was the duty of every man to ransom a free man who had fallen into captivity, so also was this duty recognized with regard to a slave who had been taken prisoner.‖

Faithful slaves not unfrequently, especially at the death of their master, obtained their liberty as a reward of their faithful services, and in that event usually received a part of the inheritance (Prov. XVII, 2). In default of male heirs the chief of the slaves or house-steward was, in the earliest times, sometimes adopted as a son and appointed sole heir (Gen. XV, 3), or married to the master's daughter (1 Chron. II, 34), in order that thus the property might be kept together. The latter alternative was sometimes also adopted under other circumstances: for example, if the daughters of the house could not get any free-born husbands; at any rate

*Kethub. 61 and Talmud Jerus. Baba Kama 6.

†Berachoth 16 b.

‡Berachoth ibid.

§Cf. Gittin 12 a: מאן דמרחם אבגי חרי אעבד נמי רחומי סקחיח

‖Cf. Gittin 37 b.

there was a proverb indicating this circumstance current in Jerusalem: "If your daughter is marriageable, emancipate your slave and let him become her husband."* Female slaves on the contrary, were not made entirely free unless they were demanded by some person in marriage, as it would otherwise have been no kindness to them to give them their liberty, for they were likely those, to be cast, entirely unprotected, upon the world. When therefore it was proposed to reward a female slave for faithful services, it was often considered more judicious merely to take her out of her low position and to retain her for the performance of the lighter labors of the family.†

§ 21.

g. *The Emancipation of Slaves.*

The law of Moses makes no provision for the emancipation of slaves who were not Hebrews, except in the case of the slave who had received some serious bodily injury at the hands of his master (Exod. XXI, 26, 27). But that it presupposes the possibility of his obtaining his liberty under other circumstances also is evident from Levit. XIX, 20. These circumstances and the particular manner, in which the emancipation was effected, are more fully stated by the Rabbins as follows:

1. *Emancipation in consideration of a ransom paid for him.* As the slave could, as such, own no property, his being ransomed was entirely out of the question, unless some third person paid the master the value of the slave, for the purpose of giving him his liberty. This he, accordingly, received at the very moment when the master accepted the proffered sum, without any written document being required.‡

2. *By a certificate of his discharge*, which the master delivered to the slave with his own hands, in the presence of witnesses, or, if the certificate had been signed by witnesses, by the hands of a third person. The phraseology of such certificates might vary as, e. g. "Thou art now a free man," or, "Thou belongest now to thyself," or it might be worded in some other way, provided only that in it the master dis-

*Pesachim 113 a: בתך בגרה שחרר עבדך ותן לה

†Cf. Gittin 40 a.

‡Maimon. Abadim, V, 2.

tinctly renounced his claim to the slave, and in no manner whatever reserved to himself any right to him.*

3. *By Testament*, i. e., if the master, in his last will and testament, declared the slave to be free, or either required or requested his heir to emancipate him.†

4. Lastly, *by tacit emancipation*,‡ i. e., if the master indicated, in any way whatever, that he no longer regarded the slave as such, if, e. g., he constituted him heir of his entire property,§ or gave him a free-born woman to wife, or if he numbered him among ten free Hebrews selected as participants in some sacred rite, or, in a word, if he ordered him to perform any act which only a free Hebrew was required to perform.‖ In all these cases the slave at once obtained his freedom, but in order to render this perfectly valid, a certificate of emancipation was requisite, which the master could be compelled to execute.¶

Over slaves whom he had emancipated the master did not among the Hebrews, as was the case among the Romans and Greeks, afterwards exercise any patronage; much less was he allowed to reduce him again to the condition of a slave, if he repented of having emancipated him.** After he had obtained his liberty the slave was required to receive, in open day, and in the presence of three Hebrews, the baptism which was, in Judaism, practised in connection with the reception of proselytes,†† and was then regarded as, in every respect, a full member of the national and religious covenant of the Israelites.‡‡

*Maimon. Abah. V, 3, and VII, 1. Several complete formulas for such certificates employed in later times are found in כנסת הגדולה to Jore dea cap. 267.

†Maimon. ibid VI, 4 and Sechija umathana IX, 11.

‡Similar to the Roman manumissio per mensam, just as the two preceding modes of emancipation correspond with the Roman manumissio per epistolam and per testamentam.

§Mischna Peah III, 8.

‖Gittin fol. XXXIX, 40.

¶Maimon. Abad. VIII, 17.

**Maimon. ibid.

††Jebamoth fol. XLVII; Issure biah XIII, 12.

‡‡Maimon. Issure biah XII, 17.

§ 22.

*The Influence of the Legislation of Moses upon the Condition of Slaves among the neighboring Peoples.*

The example of the kind treatment, which slaves received among the Hebrews, was itself sufficient to exert an ennobling influence upon the surrounding peoples, in their treatment of their slaves, and there is really no evidence that among these peoples the condition of slaves was, as a general thing, as deplorable, as it was among the Greeks and Romans at the height of their civilization. But among the laws of Moses there was one, that had been enactod for the benefit of foreign slaves, and which could not fail to be eminently efficacious in this particular. According to Deut. XXIII, 16, 17, no slave who had escaped from his master, and had taken refuge in the dominions of the Israelites, could, under any circumstances, be delivered up to his master, or taken as a slave. He might, on the contrary, settle, as a free man, in the land, in whatever place he chose, and was entitled to all civil rights, which the law guaranteed to the freeborn foreigner. If the slaves of surrounding peoples could thus without difficulty escape from harsh treatment, and, in fact, from slavery altogether, their masters, must, of course, have exerted themselves so to gain their attachment, by clemency and kindness, that they would not be tempted to seek their liberty and the recognition of their rights as men, in a land where these were guaranteed by a sacred law.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### REMARKS ON MATTHEW VI, 25–34.

By E. Greenwald, D. D., Easton, Pa.

THIS passage has generally been considered difficult to be understood. It appears to recommend a state of idleness, or absolute neglect of the active business and useful employments of life, which in the condition of civilized society, are rendered necessary for the subsistence of individuals and families, and for the prosperity and good order of communi-

ties and nations. As the common sense of the reader teaches him, that it cannot be right for all men to feel and act in this manner, his mind becomes involved in difficulty and doubt as to its true meaning. Commentators have felt the same difficulty, and have labored to remove it, by putting a forced construction upon its expressions—a construction the very opposite, indeed, of that which its terms convey.

The expression "Take no thought," which occurs so frequently in this passage, is perhaps not too strong a rendering of the original Greek words μη μεριμνᾶτε, which literally mean *do not care*, or *be not solicitous*. The feeling which it recommends is unconcern or indifference about the means of preserving life, resulting in absolute inaction in reference to the procurement of the food and clothing, which are necessary for our comfortable subsistence. Let us examine closely the several verses.

In v. 25, it is said: "Therefore I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on." The impression which is necessarily left upon the mind by the reading of this passage is, that Jesus required the persons to whom it was addressed to entertain no solicitude as to the means of the preservation of their lives, to have no concern as to the source, whence their food, drink and clothing are to come, to make no provision for these things, and indeed, not even to "take" or indulge a careful "thought" about them. This is certainly the literal, and plain meaning of the words. This is the meaning which would be attached to the language by the plain, common-sense reader of the passage. And this, we have no doubt, is the correct meaning — the precise idea which Christ intended to convey.

That our Lord had this idea in his mind, and designed to convey it by the terms he used, to the minds of those to whom he spake, is evident from the following verses. In v. 26 he says: "Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?" In this verse, Christ illustrated the propriety of absolute want of care or solicitude about the preservation of life by food and clothing, on the part of his hearers, by the fact that the birds make no provision whatever for the future, and have no concern or thought about it, and yet their necessary food is provided by Providence for them. This illustration would obviously leave the impression on the minds of his hearers,

that it was altogether unnecessary for them to sow, to reap, or to gather into barns, and yet they would be provided for. This impression Christ undoubtedly intended to leave on the minds of those, to whom he spake. By citing the example of the birds, he intended to recommend, that those whom he addressed should pursue the same course, with the promise of the same result.

In the 28th, 29th, and 30th verses he proceeds to say: "And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow, they toil not neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith." This beautiful illustration was evidently designed by our Lord, to relieve the minds of his hearers of all care concerning the clothing of their bodies, by the consideration, that the lilies make no provision whatever for it; they neither toil nor spin, yet they are far more beautifully adorned than human beings that do. Would not the plain unlettered hearer, — and such were Christs disciples, — infer from these words, that it was wholly unnecessary for him to toil or spin, and yet that Providence would provide clothing for him, as it was provided for the lily of the field? That, which is so plainly the import of the language he used, was undoubtedly the idea which Christ intented to convey.

The verses which follow, are, if possible, still stronger than the preceding. In the 31st verse he says: "Therefore take no thought, saying, what shall we eat? or, what shall we drink? or wherewithal shall we be clothed? for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." This verse plainly implies that Christ's hearers were to dismiss from their minds, not only care, but even all thought of the source whence their food and clothing would come, or of the means by which they would be provided. They were required to give their attention to other things altogether, to spend no time nor exertion in providing the means of living, trusting implicitly, that ther Heavenly Father would, without any forethought of theirs, prepare for them all that would be required.

He concludes by reiterating the same directions in the most emphatic manner possible: "Take, therefore, no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself." Such language as this was certalnly adap-

ted to produce, in the breast of the hearer, absolute indifference concerning the events of to-morrow. He would make no arrangements as to where and how he would live the next day; he would lay up no stores to satisfy his wants; contented with the provision of to-day, he would trust that, from some source that he neither knew nor cared about, the necessary supply would come for to-morrow.

This appears to be the plain import, and the obvious intention of our Saviour's language. But the reader, as well as the interpreter of the Scriptures, becomes alarmed at the literal interpretation of the words Christ used. He considers that if these directions were universally practiced by mankind, the world would be reduced to barbarism, and the utmost wretchedness would prevail over the earth. Rightly believing, therefore, that Christ was too wise a teacher of religion and morals, to disseminate doctrines that would reduce men to the condition of savages, he seeks for another interpretation of our Saviour's language, and ingeniously endeavors to reconcile it to his ideas of what is right and proper. Commentators have therefore almost invariably interpreted our Lord's language as meaning, not that the persons whom he addressed should take *no* thought, but that they should not take excessive thought for the things of to-morrow. They suppose that Jesus only meant to check that undue care for the future and inordinate attachment to earthly riches which prevail so generally in the minds of men. But although this is a lesson, that may with propriety be inferred and drawn incidentally from his language, and it is very proper so to use it, still it seems plain that such was not the prime object of Christ, nor is such the import of his words. He does not say "take no excessive thoughts," but "take no thought," for to-morrow. The original Greek imports, not "have no inordinate care," but "have no care" — not, "be not unduly solicitous," but, "do not be solicitous at all." When, after reading or hearing such interpretations as this, we turn to the chapter, and read the entire passage carefully, we always feel that such an interpretation is forced and unnatural, and does violence to the plain meaning of language. And we venture to assert that no interpreter of this kind, is satisfied with his own construction, but feels that, after all his efforts at ingenious criticism, he has not only failed to satisfy his hearers, but he has also failed to satisfy himself.

But we may now be asked, what are we to do? Must we take the passage in its obvious meaning, and conclude that Christ intended to give the general direction that men should altogether cease to have any care for the future? Did he intend that men should wholly cease their labors, and no longer sow and reap, nor spin and weave, nor in any other way make provision for the supply of their future wants? Is it wrong for me to purchase to-day, what will not only feed and clothe myself and family to-day, but will also supply the wants of to-morrow? And is it contrary to the Gospel for me, or any one else, to gather and lay by in store, during the fertile months of Summer, what will support me and others during the sterile months of winter? Is it not known and acknowledged that those contented, easy, indolent people that literally, "take no thought for the morrow," are among the most unprofitable members of the community? Did Christ intend that men should literally be brought back to a state of savage nature, roaming naked over the forest, and subsisting on roots, and herbs, and fruits as they grow spontaneously? Would not all this, and infinitely more of wretchedness than we can now imagine, be the necessary and speedy result, if mankind would literally "take no thought for the morrow?"

Now, we do not believe that Jesus intended that men in general, should take no thought for the morrow. The great object of his life was to awaken thoughts for the future in the breasts of unreflecting men. We believe, however, that Jesus intended the language under consideration to be taken literally, but that he did not intend to make the direction general to mankind. He intended it as furnishing special direction and encouragement to his disciples in the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed. We consider the language to be similar to that which he uttered on another occasion: "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purse, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat." No one supposes that this latter direction is general, or that it is improper for Christians, or for Christian ministers to provide money in their purse, or clothing or shoes upon their persons, in order to their support and comfort in life. It had a single special object, and no reader of the Scriptures ever supposed that it had any other.

It must be borne in mind that the Sermon on the Mount, of which this passage forms a part, although containing many precepts that are applicable to all sorts and conditions of men, yet was delivered immediately to Christ's disciples, and was primarily intended for their special benefit. Many of the other discourses of our Lord were addressed to the promiscuous multitudes that attended his ministry, but this was delivered in private, and directly to his chosen disciples. At the beginning of the 5th chapter of Matthew which contains a report of this sermon it is said: "And seeing the multitudes, he went up into the mountain, and when he was set, his disciples came unto him, and he opened his mouth, and taught them." It is evident from this language, that Christ, having been pressed by the multitude, and wishing to be alone with his disciples, went up into a mountain apart and unobserved by the people, and when he had reached the place of retirement, to which he had wished to go, and had seated himself there, his disciples, to whom he had given intimations of the place where they would find him, came to him, and being seated around him, he addressod to them the admirable instructions of this sermon. It was originally delivered privately by the Great Teacher, to his select company of disciples.

It was to have been expected that, among the general lessons which were designed to instruct them in the knowledge of the principles of the Gospel, and which they would be required to inculcate every where in their work of carrying out their commission as Christ's ambassadors to mankind, some things would be uttered especially adapted to their circumstances, and designed for their individual encouragement and direction. It may be remarked that although Christ began this sermon, with his disciples only as his auditors, yet the anxious multitude soon found out the place of his retirement, as on other occasions, and gradually gathered around him, so that at the close of it, it is said: "And when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrines."

The circumstances of the disciples were such as to demand precisely the encouraging sentiments which this passage contains. They were poor fishermen and supported themselves and their families, by the humble and laborious employment of taking fish in the sea of Galilee, and disposing of them to the inhabitants of the surrounding country. With all their industry, and diligent employment of time, they only

procured from their business, a meagre subsistence. But Christ required them to abandon their business altogether, and attend personally upon his ministry — they were required to travel with him among strangers upon whose hospitality they had no claim, and they and their families must in the mean time, have the means of subsistence. It was their duty also to preach the gospel to others, and for this purpose, it was necessary for them to make long journeys. They and their doctrines were persecuted and hated; wealth and power were with their enemies, whilst they were poor and feeble, and were literally sent forth as sheep among wolves. Their business of fishing, in the mean time, was neglected and broken up, and they could not derive their snbsistence from that source. The anxious question would necessarily come up in their minds, *how shall we live?* If in our poverty, we abandon our means of living, and give ourselves wholly to the work to which Christ has called us, where shall we, and those dependent on us, obtain bread to eat, and raiment to put on? This would be a natural and necessary question. For the purpose of quieting their fears, and relieving their minds from all apprehension on this head, as well as affording them the fullest encouragement to devote all their time and energies to this work, Christ addressed to them this passage, telling them literally to "take *no thought* for the morrow"— to give themselves not the smallest concern on the subject of their support, and not even to ask whence their food and clothing were to come. He assured them that their Father in heaven knew that they needed these things and would provide what they wanted; that they should "seek first" and exclusively "the kingdom of God and his righteousness," that is, they should give themselves wholly to the work of advancing the kingdom and glory, and righteousness of God, the Gospel, and "all these things would be added unto them." He meant that they should understand him literally, and act accordingly, when he concluded by saying to them: "Take therefore no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself," i. e., he would take care that their food and raiment should not fail.

This explanation of the passage is, we think, natural, reasonable, and consistent. It is not far-fetched, but easy, it does no violence to language, but retains its obvious meaning; it is in strict accordance with the facts as they existed, and in harmony with other passages of the same kind, and the mind feels that it is satisfactory and conclusive.

# ARTICLE III.

## REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

### LI.

### William Christopher Berkenmeyer.

In the preparation of our sketches we have often expressed the regret, that the material relating to the early ministers of our Church is so meagre, particularly in the case of those who passed away more than a century ago. If at an earlier period, when some of the connecting links with the past still remained among us, an effort had been made to rescue from oblivion the honored names of our ministers who came to this country in its colonial history, the difficulty would have been greatly diminished and the result, much more satisfactory. We have, however, thought that, if, in removing the dust and cobwebs from old tomb-stones, we did nothing more than record the names of departed worthies and furnish the dates, we would render a service grateful to the Church, and not unacceptable to the future historian.

The virtues of the men who planted the standard of Lutheranism in this Western hemisphere have frequently been the subject of remark. No Church has more reason to be grateful to a kind Providence for its ecclesiastical ancestry. Our earlier ministry will compare most favorably with that of any denomination of Christians in this country. There was, too, a high appreciation of their character and their services by those who were acquainted with their labors, but they are less known to fame in consequence of the general ignorance of the German language which prevailed at the time among other branches of the Christian Church. In fervid piety, earnest zeal, enthusiastic devotion to this work, in untiring and self-denying labor, they were unsurpassed by any of their cotemporaries.

Immigrations of Lutherans to the State of New York were made at a very early period in the history of this country. These persons were from Holland, who here sought an asylum and a sanctuary soon after the settlement of the Dutch in New Netherlands. For a long time they were without a

regular pastor, but they convened in private houses for prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, a layman from among them being selected for the purpose of conducting the services. In the course of time accessions were made to their number from Germany and France. In the summer of 1657 the first Lutheran minister, John Ernest Gœtwater, arrived on the banks of the Hudson, sent by the Lutheran Consistory of Holland to minister to the spiritual wants of their brethren of the same faith in the colony. At a subsequent period, under the patronage of the English Government, the number of arrivals continued steadily to increase. In the year 1708 came the Rev. Joshua Kocherthal, an evangelical man, with some poor Palatines, members of his congregation, who, in this "land of the free" desired protection from the sanguinary persecutions, from which they were suffering in the Southern part of the Palatinate in Germany.* In their petition to Queen Anne, after reaching England, they stated, "that they were necessitous and had been reduced to their miserable condition by the ravages committed by the French in the lower Palatinate, where they lost all that they had," and prayed that they might "be transported to some of her majesty's plantations in America." The Queen received their request with favor, and it was first proposed to settle them in Jamaica or Antigua, as there were on those islands large tracts of uninhabited land and a great want of white people, but as the climate was so much warmer than the part of Germany, whence they came, it was thought that the heat would be greater than their physical constitution could endure. They were, therefore, located upon the Hudson river in the province of New York, where "they might be useful to the British kingdom, particularly in the production of naval stores and as a frontier against the French and their Indians."

*The Lower Palatinate was situated on both sides of the Rhine, with a territory of 1590 square miles and 305000 inhabitants. Here originally Protestantism and Popery were equally tolerated. The people were, however, often exposed to the calamities of war and suffered from the most horrible devastations, particularly during the reign of Louis XIV. Thousands of the persecuted inhabitants found refuge in the camp of that brave and great soldier the Duke of Marlborough, who, with the Prince of Savoy, commanded at that time, the allied armies. Little later than this it was that, Queen Anne moved with compassion, extended relief to these pious and persecuted people, most of whom were Lutherans. In 1709 she sent a fleet to Rotterdam and conveyed 7000 of them at one time to Protestant England; about 4000 of these, the same year immigrated to the United States of America. Some of them settled in New York, others in Pennsylvania and North Carolina.

Before their departure, they were made free citizens of the kingdom. The petition of Kocherthal to the Queen of England is the first official record we meet with respecting these Palatines, who continued to immigrate to this country. The Queen also granted to Kocherthal "a reasonable portion of land for a glebe, not exceeding five hundred acres, with liberty to sell a suitable proportion thereof for his better maintenance, till he should be in a condition to live by the produce of the remainder." His people, fifty in number, were also allowed "a maintenance for twelve months after their arrival with tools to work with." The lands given to this first colony of Palatines were situated on the West bank of the Hudson, about sixty miles above the city of New York, in what was then called Ulster county, in the vicinity of the present town of Newburgh. In 1710 there was a second immigratien of these Palatines with orders to the Governor of the Province "to provide for them lodging and provisions." These were soon followed by several thousand more of their brethren, who were settled by Governor Hunter on both sides of the Hudson, one hundred miles above New York, six thousand acres of land having been purchased from Mr. Livingston for the purpose. During the reign of the Queen ample provision was made for the religious and secular instruction of these colonists and the patent expressly declares that the tract of land was granted "for the maintenance of Lutheran parish schools and ministers for the Germans, who either had settled, or who might hereafter, in the neighborhood of the river Hudson." If the benevolent intentions of the Queen had been successfully carried into execution by the officers of the crown in the colony, the Lutheran Church in the State of New York, at the present time, would be in the possession of a fund more than adequate for the munificent endowment of all her literary and theological institutions. Kocherthal, the faithful pastor, died in 1719. Anterior to his death, however, we meet with the name of Michael Christian Knoll, who subscribes himself "Minister of the Lutheran Protestant congregation in the city of New York." At a very early period reference is also made to Rev. Justus Falkener, as minister among the Palatines at Loonenburgh (now Athens,) N.Y . He died in 1723.

The year 1725 marks the arrival of Rev. William Christopher Berkenmeyer who, for so long a period, exercised an important influence on the interests of our Church in the

State of New York. Of his parentage and early life we know nothing, but we infer from his subsequent career, that he enjoyed the best advantages in his youth and was carefully trained for the work of the ministry, to which he had devoted himself. We first find him in this country, laboring in the city of New York and preaching in the Dutch, as well as the German, language, officiating also at other places where his services were required. He soon after took regular charge of the congregation at Quassaik, where he continued to labor until he closed his earthly career. In the *Documentary History* of the State of New York, containing various papers relating to the Palatines, we find the following references to Mr. Berkenmeyer which we presume at this distant period, will be interesting to our readers:

"In the year 1725 the minister William Christoffer Berkenmeyer came here and commenced te service at Quassaik. In the year 1727 he is by writing desired to administer there."

"His late Excellency William Burnet, favorising the Minister William Christoffer Berkenmeyer, has protected him in the service of Quassaik, self by a Letter Missive.

Copia.

"Reverendo Viro Domino Wilhelmo Christophoro Berkenmeijro Guliemus Burnet S. P. D.

Quoad agrum in Colonia Campensi de quo video litem aliquam orituram, nil aliud dicam nisi quod Justitia omnibus pateat et Controversiæ debent dirimi in curiis civilibus secundum leges. Literæ Patentes nuper datæ sunt, ut vocantur; quibus ho'i'es certi agrum istum *pro communi bono illius coloniæ* possident, et si aliqua controversia de sensu illarum literarum oriatur coram judicibus litigandum est. Non amplius mei juris est, nisi forsan coram me lis veniat, quare nihil debeo de illa re vel affirmare vel negare.

Datum Calendis Martii Novæ Eboraci A. C. MDCCXXVI.

Translation.

"To the Reverend Minister Will. Christ. Berkenmijer William Burnet Greeting

Concerning the Glebe in the Country which as I see will come in Proces, I shall speak no more, than that the Justice stands open for every one; and the Controversies are to be dissolved in the Courts of Common Law. after the Direction of the Law. Letters Patents, as they are called; are newly given by which certain Families do possesse such Glebe Land, as a *Common Good* or *for the Common Best of the Colonie*, and if any Disputes arrise concerning the meaning of these Letters Patents, the Cause must be brought before the Justices. It stands not further by me, if not, can be, the Cause should come unto me, for which Reason, I ought not to determine, or to dislike anything in the Cause.

Written the 1st of March, at New York A. C. 1726."*

*Documentary History of New York Vol. III, p. 590.

To the curious the following extract from the *Unions-Contract* will prove of some interest:

"We do likewise herewith by the Power and Authority, given to us by the aforesaid Patent, Call Constitute and receive Mr. William Christoffer Berkenmeyer Lutheran Minister of New York, for our lawfull Teacher of the Parish of Quassaik, to minister unto us, twice a Year after the manner aforsaid, as well in preaching the Holy Gospel purely, according to the Holy Scripture and the Symbolical Books of our Lutheran Church, as in Administering the Holy Sacraments to Christi Institution, and practising the usual-Ceremonies of the fellow Believers of the unalterable Confession of Augsburg. Promising likewise to pay him the Income of the 500 Acres aforesaid as soon as any there shall arise, and acknowledge him not only as our Teacher, but also the Authority given to him by the aforesaid Patent, as also whenever he lands on our shore to receive him and bring him back on board of the Vessell."*

Our reader may also be interested in the following letter, as a specimen of the manner in which such things were done in his day, written in 1746 by Mr. Berkenmeyer:

"Loonenburgh in ye County of Albany.

Having considered His Excellency's our Right Honourable Governor's Orders against Mr. John Lodewick Hofgoed, bearing date ye 30 of May 1746 and ye 8th of Novr. 1746 as also that Consistorial advice of that Most Revd. Cosistory at Hamburgh cum annexis, bearing Date ye 30th Nov. 1746, I the Subscriber of this do humbly submit to both ye Political and Ecclesiastical Decision in this business, and do heartily agree with the most humble petition of our distressed Lutheran Brethren at Poghquaick in Beekmans precint further relief and Deliverance or assistance against ye Sd unlawfull and Unworthy Minister Hofgoed, I Testify and agree & Beg, Praying for ye safety of Our most Gratious Souvereign & Especially for ye Prosperity of ye Legislature and all ye Protestant Churches within this our Government.

William Christoph Berkenmeyer
Protestant Lutheran Minister in ye City &
County of Albany."†

Although Mr. Berkenmeyer, during the greater part of his ministry in this country, had his residence in Loonenburgh,‡ he, all the time, occupied very much the position of

*Documentary History of New York, Vol. III, p. 591.

†Ibid Vol. III, p. 983.

‡This is said to be one of the oldest Lutheran Churches in the United States, and has been supplied with the following succession of Pastors:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1703 | Justus Falkener, | 1837 | Thomas Lape, |
| 1704 | John C- Leps, | 1845 | Sylvander Curtis, |
| 1725 | William C. Berkenmeyer, | 1848 | Matthew Waldenmeyer, |
| 1783 | Frederick A. Walberg, | 1851 | Augustus L. Bridgman. |
| 1791 | John F. Ernst, | 1853 | Isaac Kimball, |
| 1800 | Frederick H. Quitman, D.D. | 1855 | William H. Emerick, |
| 1803 | Philip F. Mayer, D.D. | 1858 | William N. Scholl. |
| 1833 | Adolphus Rumph, | | |

an itinerant Bishop, and was constantly engaged in visiting the destitute portions of the State, and attending to the spiritual wants of his brethren in the faith. There is reason to believe, that he scattered much precious seed, which God graciously owned and blessed. Many of those places, at which our Church has, at the present time, flourishing congregations, in the State of New York, witnessed the fidelity of his labors and felt the influence of his efforts. He died in the autumn of 1751, in the 69th year of his age, and the 27th of his ministry in this country, and was buried near the pulpit in the old Church building at Loonenburgh. The following epitaph, prepared, no doubt, by himself seven years before his death, is copied from a tablet, a red free stone, placed over his remains at the time of his death, to mark the place of his interment. The stone is still perfect and the inscription quite legible.

Immanuel
Dormitorium
Berkenmeyerianum
Pio mortalitatis sensu Præparatum
Anno
Aetatis Bodendici Ducatu
Lunæburgensi Cœptæ LVIII
Ministerii inter Americanos
Boreales AmBulatorii XVIIII
Officii apud Albanienses
et Loonenburgenses fixi XIII
Reparatæ
Omnibus omnino quotquot fuere sunt eruntq.
hominibus
Solaq. in ΘΕΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΝ fide obtinendæ
Salutis CIƆIƆCCXLIIII
εξελεξατο εν Χριστῳ
προ καταβολης κοςμου
ουδεν αρα νυν κατακριμα
τοις εν Χριστῳ Ιησου

Mr. Berkenmeyer was regarded in his day as a very learned man. Traditions are still preserved of the high reputation he had as a scholar among the intelligent and influential of his cotemporaries. He was a man of great industry and unceasingly devoted to the interests of his congregation. This we readily infer from some memorials of his labors, that

are still preserved.* He was also very much interested in the African race. In the Church Books are recorded the Baptisms and Confirmations of quite a number of slaves. Dr. Muhlenberg† refers to him kindly in the *Hallische Nachrichten*, but their intercourse was not very frequent in consequence of the distance between them, and the few facilities of communication between different parts of the country, afforded in those days. He was also every where highly esteemed and possessed the cordial confidence of all classes. He seems to have been on intimate terms with the Governor of the Province and as his guest often enjoyed the hospitalities of his house. His library was quite large, which he bequeathed on his death to the Lutheran Church at Loonenburgh, as an evidence of his attachment to the congregation, among whom he had so long labored. This Library, consisting of several hundred volumes, however, became in the course of time very much scattered; many of the books were carried off and others destroyed. About fifty years after the death of Mr. Berkenmeyer, when our Church had almost lost its existence in Loonenburgh and another branch of the Christian Church had been receiving for more than twenty years the greater portion of the annual revenue derived from the Lutheran glebe,‡ this Library was gathered together and placed as *rubbish* in the loft of the Episcopal Church§ of

*In the Library of the Historical Society of our Church, at Gettysburg, Pa., there is a manuscript volume, folio, of nearly four hundred pages, in Mr. Berkenmeyer's own hand-writing, containing the Protocol of the Church at Loonenburgh, from 1725, till 1750.

†Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg, reached this country in 1742, seventeen years after the arrival of Mr. Berkenmeyer. He resided here nine years before the death of Mr. B.

‡This occurred some time after Rev. Dr. Mayer's removal to Philadelphia in 1806, through the influence of members of the Episcopal Church. In 1832, these funds were withheld from this object and devoted to the support of a Lutheran Minister, who was called to take care of our Lutheran interests. From this period, the Church has gradually increased and again occupies a favorable position. Rev. W. N. Scholl is the present Pastor.

§In our early history the most friendly and intimate relations existed between Lutherans and Episcopalians. The Lutheran Consistory at Rhinebeck in 1797 adopted the following resolution: "That on account of an intimate connexion, subsisting between the English Episcopal and the Lutheran Churches, and the identity of their doctrine and near alliance of their Church discipline, this Consistory will never acknowledge a newly erected Lutheran Church, merely English, in places, where the members may partake of the service of the said English Episcopal Church." Rev. Dr. Kunze, one of our most learned and prominent min

the place. Many of these books were never recovered, but a couple of boxes of those, that could be found were collected and presented to Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, some years ago, during the Presidency of Rev. Dr. Keller.

The query here naturally arises, what is the reason that the Lutheran Church is not more numerous and influential in a section of the country, in which at one time it possessed so many advantages and exercised so much influence. Able and good men laid its foundation. There was the best material upon which to operate, the material, which afterwards garnered into other Churches, proved most valuable and efficient. Our ministers and people enjoyed the confidence, regard and sympathy of Christians of all denominations. To this inquiry several replies might be given, but the most prominent causes, which operated against our interests, were the want of an adequate and well-educated ministry for the Church, as it increased and extended itself over more territory, and our earlier ministers, who had been educated in Europe, passed away; and the strong prejudices, which existed against the introduction of the English language into the services of the sanctuary. For a long period, there was no effort made to perpetuate an English Lutheran Church in this country, or to encourage those who were not benefitted by exercises conducted in the German, in consequence of their ignorance of the language, to retain their connexion with the Church of their birth, and by many the fear was entertained, that our Church would become extinct or altogether absorbed in the English Churches of the land.

It is now often a matter of astonishment that our Church ever survived the difficulties she had to encounter in this Western world. Mr. Berkenmeyer, even in his time indulged in gloomy forebodings, not only in reference to his own congregation at Loonenburgh, but in reference to our Church, generally in this country. On a certain occasion, one Saturday night, retiring, no doubt, when his mind was deeply concerned with regard to the Church, in a dream he thought he he saw a large vessel ascend the Hudson, but just as it came in view, opposite his residence, it began to sink. It remained, sometime, overwhelmed in the water, when it arose, moved onward and briskly proceeded up the river. Often he

isters, and Pastor at the time in New York City, endorsed the sentiment, and reccommended the English portion of our membership to unite with the Episcopal Church.

referred to this dream and gave its interpretation. He made an application of it to our Church. It would experience reverses, become depressed and almost extinct, but gradually it would recover from its low position, and become again a prosperous Church. If now he were permitted to return to the earth and revisit the scenes of the past on the banks of the Hudson, how great would be his amazement; he would find his visions of the future fully realized, and his fondest anticipations more than fulfilled. *The little one has indeed become a thousand and the small one a strong nation.* And if the Church is true to herself, faithful to the high mission assigned her in the Providence of God, a brighter day will yet dawn upon Zion, still greater things may be accomplished. She will go forth to achieve powerful and glorious conquests for Christ and his kingdom. *She will arise and shine for her light hath come, and the glory of the Lord hath risen upon her.*

LII.

## Peter Nicholas Sommer.

Among the pioneers of the Church, who proclaimed the glad tidings of salvation to the early settlers in this country, the subject of the present sketch is also worthy of grateful recollection and a permanent record in the annals of the past. Although his name may not have been sounded so far as some others yet wherever it is known it is only another term for unaffected piety, for undoubted sincerity, for earnest and enlightened zeal in the great work of the Gospel ministry.

Peter Nicholas Sommer was born Jan. 9th, 1709, in Hamburgh. Of his early life, too, we know very little, except that he was reared under sound religious influences and, at an early period, his attention was directed to the subject of the ministry. He received a thorough education, classical and professional, and on the completion of his course was licensed as a Theological candidate, to be ordained as soon as he was ready to assume the charge of a congregation. He was yet a resident in his native place without any plans for the future, awaiting the indications of Providence, when a call for usefulness was presented in his Master's vineyard in this Western world.

A detachment of the colony of Germans, sent over in 1710, to this country from the Palatinate, under the protec-

tion of Queen Anne of England, located in Schoharie valley in 1712, and as the most of them had been brought up in the Lutheran faith in their native land, their early associations and habits still clung to them. Although they were for some time without the services of a minister of the Gospel, they were not unmindful of their religious obligations. They assembled from time to time in private houses to encourage one another in their Christian duties, to mingle their hearts and voices in prayer and praise, and to read the Scriptures and the devotional manuals they had brought with them from their native country. They were also occasionally visited by Rev. W.C. Berkenmeyer, Pastor of the Lutheran Church at Loonenburgh (now Athens,) N. Y., who preached to them and administered the sacraments.

In 1714 this Christian flock was organized into a Church, but they sensibly realized their spiritual destitution in the want of a regular Shepherd to break unto them the word of life. They therefore determined, if possible, to secure the services of a suitable Pastor. The effort was successful through the influeuce of the Lutheran Consistorium in London and resulted in the call of Mr. Sommer. He accepted the invitation, and on the 24th of October 1742 left his native land and friends for his missionary work, and after some detention in London arrived in New York, in the spring of 1743, less than one year after the arrival of Dr. Muhlenberg. The following record, then made by himself in the Church Books will, at this day be read with interest: "*In the name of the Holy Trinity*, I, Peter Nicholas Sommer, of the city of Hamburgh, received on the seventh day of the month of September, in the year 1742 the call, as Evangelical Lutheran preacher of the congregation of Schoharie. Authorized by the Consistory of Trinitatis in London and ordained by the Rev. John George Palm, to take charge of said congregation, I departed from Hamburgh to London and, under God's almighty protection, I arrived in London on the 25th of October. Circumstances prevented my setting out for New York until the 10th of March 1743, where I arrived on the 21st of April, and on the 27th of the same month, I started for Albany, where I remained until the 25th of May. Then I went to Schoharie, where on the first Sunday of Trinity, I preached my introductory sermon. The Lord our God be futhermore with me and my beloved congregation, that the great end of my arduous office may be attained, that the name of the Lord may be glorified! Amen." He

met with a most cordial reception. The congregation rejoiced, that they would no longer be as sheep without a shepherd. He entered at once upon the performance of his duties and on the 3d of July 1743, administered the Lord's Supper to one hundred communicants. In this field of usefulness he continued for nearly a half century, laboring indefatigably for the spiritual advancement of those, committed to his care, and revered by all who were brought within the reach of his influence. His labors were not, however, confined to Schoharie. His field was very extensive. He also acted as an itinerant minister for all the surrounding country, gathering into congregations our scattered members, preaching the word and administering the sacraments at stated periods in destitute Lutheran settlements. He visited, during his ministry at Schoharie, Stone Arabia, Little Falls and Canajoharie on the Mohawk River; Rhinebeck, East and West Camp, Claverack and Loonenburgh, on the Hudson; Hosack in Rensselaer county; Albany, Helleburg and Beaverdam in Albany county; and Cobleskill and other points in Schoharie county. Upon all these places he left a marked and decided impression, furnishing the clearest evidence of his ample qualifications for the work, in which hs was engaged and his fidelity in the discharge of its arduous duties. It was no easy task to travel as he did, on errands of love, thirty, forty and even fifty miles distant, to fill an appointment, through a new country with scarcely a public road and no conveniences, exposed to constant danger from the hostile attacks of Indians and wild beasts. In the wilderness our people often worshipped in those days within the sound of the howlings of the beasts of the forest and in full view of the wigwams of the still fiercer and more ruthless Aborigines of our country. No danger, no difficulty, however, could deter him from looking after his brethren, whose interests he regarded as having special claims upon his sympathies and his efforts. He was interested in the work, in which he had enlisted, and cheerfully did he labor, that he might be able to fulfil the object of his mission and win souls to Christ. He lived during an eventful period of our national history. He with his Church survived the perils of two sanguinary wars, the French and the Revolutionary, and witnessed the dissolution of one government and the establishment of another, yet during all these convulsions, exciting scenes and stirring events, he shared with his people the trials, dangers and losses, to which they were exposed. He was the untiring devoted Pastor, wise, faithful

and successful in his work, seeking and improving opportunities for doing good, and enjoying evident tokens of the Divine favor. During these struggles his congregations suffered many hardships and lost not a few of their members yet they increased and flourished in the midst of all the privations and hardships, to which they were subjected. His members were often driven from their homes, and deprived of their property; many of them fell victims to the tomahawk and the scalping knife of a savage enemy, but the Church was still preserved under the labors of this faithful servant of God.

In the year 1746 a company of volunteers, members of his Church at Schoharie, previous to their departure to join an expedition against Canada, assembled in the sanctuary and after being addressed by Mr. Sommer partook of the Eucharist. They went to war in the fear of God and in reliance on the strength of the Lord of Hosts. Whilst the battle of Durbach was progressing, he was within five miles of the scene of action and within hearing of the firing, engaged in holding Divine service in a private house. All who were assembled with him expected to be captured by the enemy or massacred by the Indians. But he sought to remove their fears, to encourage them to put their trust in the Lord, assuring them, that He was on their side and would prosper the right. He read to them, on this occasion, the ninety-first Psalm for the purpose of inspiring their confidence and strengthening their hearts. He was very much interested in our Revolutionary struggle and although a foreigner was, in his feelings and purposes, true to his adopted country and deeply sympathised with all her interests. He loved the cause of freedom, and for its defence and advancement he was prepared to make any sacrifice, to submit to any trial, endure any suffering. Although the red man of the forest, under the influence of evil advisers, so often occupied a hostile position to his white brethren, Mr. Sommer was deeply concerned in reference to his spiritual condition and labored earnestly for his conversion, and the Church record shows, that not a few of the race were subdued into the obedience of the Gospel by his faithful preaching and zealous efforts.

In the year 1768 the subject of our sketch was called to experience a sad affliction. He was suddenly smitten with blindness. For many long years he was not permitted to see the light of the sun, or to look upon the countenances of his own family and the members of his congregation. Al-

though he was compelled to grope his way in darkness, yet during the whole period, he regularly and with great faithfulness continued to discharge his official duties. On the Lord's Day he was conducted to the pulpit by one of his sons or the chorister of the Church, who gave out the Hymns and read the lessons from Scripture, while he preached the Gospel to the people and implored God's blessing upon them. If deprived of physical sight, he could, with the eye of faith, penetrate the mysteries of Divine truth, behold wondrous things in the Gospel and enjoy communion with his Saviour, in whose presence he was assured, that there was fulness of joy. He could look forward with confidence to the abode of the blessed and there he desired that his beloved people, redeemed by the same precious blood, might dwell forever and ever. But the most remarkable fact, connected with this Providential dispensation was that, after the lapse of twenty years towards the close of his ministry, his vision was suddenly restored to him. He awoke from one of his peaceful slumbers on a beautiful Sabbath morning and lo! he could see, his eyes were opened. We can easily conceive, what gratitude and gladness filled his soul! The first object that greeted his sight was his Church, an object so dear to his heart and to which he was so closely bound by many fond associations. To this sacred edifice he speedily repaired and, humbly approaching its altar, on bended knees rendered thanks to his Father in Heaven for opening his eyes and permitting him again to look upon his family and his flock, from whom he had been so long shut out in total darkness. How impressive the scene, and how deeply it must have affected the hearts of those who witnessed the act!

In the year 1788 much to the regret of his congregations, whom he had served forty-nine years, Mr. Sommer, now almost an octogenarian, retired from the active duties of the ministry, in consequence of his advanced age and increasing infirmities, and removed to Sharon in Schoharie county, to spend his declining years, surrounded by his children and children's children. After his removal he survived seven years, when on the 27th of October 1795 in the 87th year of his age he met the destroyer in the calm triumphs of faith, and gently passed from the toils of earth to the rewards of Heaven, illustrating most beautifully the truth of the promise "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in good old age." His remains were interred on his farm, whence after having rested for sixty-five years, they

were recently removed to the Cemetery, at Schoharie, where the Old Church once stood, and in which he had, for so long a period, proclaimed the riches of redeeming grace. Appropriate services were held on the occasion, conducted by Rev. Dr. Lintner who had been pastor of the Church for thirty years, and Rev. Edmund Belfour, the present Pastor, the latter delivering a discourse from the words — *The memory of the just is blessed.* A monument has since been erected on the spot, as an evidence of the regard with which his memory is still cherished in the community.

Mr. Sommer was united in marriage, May 16th 1744, to Maria, the daughter of Jonathan Kaiser of Stone Arabia. From this union there were several children, who settled in Sharon, the descendants of whom still reside in that section of country, identified in interest with the people of God and giving their influence to the advancement of the cause of Christ, furnishing additional testimony to the truths of God's word: "The just man walketh in his integrity: his children are blessed after him." "The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children."

---

## ARTICLE IV.

### ISAAC BLESSING JACOB.

By Rev. J. K. Plitt, A. M., Phillipsburg, N. J.

When the patriarch Isaac "was old and his eyes were dim, so that he could not see," he bestowed upon his son Jacob his blessing, in these words: "Therefore God give thee of the dew of Heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine; let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee; be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee; cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be every one that blesseth thee," Gen. 27: 28, 29. In view of the infirmities which were increasing upon him, because of advancing age, and in order that his mind might be free from domestic cares in his expectation of ap-

proaching death, the patriarch deemed it best to arrange his affairs, and to impart his blessing unto him, who was to be his successor. Esau as the elder son was naturally entitled to this distinction. The primogeniture, or birth-right, belonged to him as the first-born. And the infirm father, having a strong partiality for Esau, and following the custom of the country, intended the blessing for his elder son, forgetting, misunderstanding, or disregarding the purpose of the Almighty before made known to his house, that "*the elder should serve the younger.*" But his plans were defeated; what he meant to bestow, and thought he was bestowing, upon Esau, Jacob came and took away by subtility; and having bestowed it, it could not be recalled, for "it acted with all the force of a modern testamentary bequest."

The facts and circumstances connected with Jacob's reception of the blessing, as recorded in the sacred narrative, are full of interest and instruction. There is much in them that is at variance with correct principle and honest upright dealing. There is much that is to be condemned in the conduct of Rebekah and Jacob, by means of which Isuac was deceived and Esau defrauded, or rather deprived of that which seemed naturally to belong to him. It may be profitable in contemplating these circumstances, to observe what is to be commended and what condemned in the whole transaction, and to behold how God overrules the conduct of men even when they err, for the accomplishment of his own purposes, and the promotion of his own glory. We here perceive how good people could be betrayed into error and sin in early times, just as they often are in our own day; and we ought to learn the lesson, that we are to take them as examples to be followed by us only, in so far, as they "do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with their God." The Bible gives us a true representation of men and things. Its heroes are not faultless. It depicts the shawdows as well as the lights of human character, conduct and experience. It shows not only the good, but also the evil, that we may love and follow the one, and hate and shun the other. And in this circumstance we may find that which is well calculated to give strength to our faith in the truth of God's word, so natural are its historical narratives, so accordant with what the fallen condition of mankind would lead us to expect. If the characters who figure in the Bible were without spot or blemish, we might at once suspect that all was not right, that it was a human fabrication; and in the fact that men are

presented to us just as they actually were, and that events are recorded just as they really occurred, we have strong ground for believing that the sacred scriptures are from God, that they contain the truth, the whole truth, and that they are worthy of our entire confidence.

We have then presented to our view, Jacob receiving the blessing which seemed to belong to Esau, and which the patriarch was deceived into bestowing upon him, through stratagem on the part of Rebekah, and plain, palpable falsehoods on the part of Jacob. What is to be said of this transaction?

In the first place, the promise, given to Rebekah before the birth of these sons, Esau and Jacob, must be carefully borne in mind. For twenty years Rebekah had been barren, and yet Isaac had inherited from his father, Abraham, the promise of an inumerable posterity. During all these years, the faith of the patriarch had been severely tried, as that of Abraham before him, nevertheless Isaac entreated the Lord on behalf of his wife; his prayers were heard, and, in due time, offspring was granted them. Esau and Jacob were born, sons of prayer. But whilst they struggled in the womb, and under the impulses of the extraordinary sensations she on this account experienced, Rebekah went to inquire of the Lord. "And in answer to her inquiries, this is the communication which she received, "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and *the elder shall serve the younger*, Gen. 25 : 23. The preeminence was thus divinely promised to Jacob before his birth. "Even at his birth," as the comment of Scott is, "Jacob seemed to struggle for the primogeniture, which was an indication of his subsequent conduct. His name was given to him with evident allusion to this circumstance, and signifies *a supplanter*, or one who throws down another by taking hold of his heel."

Though the birth-right, according to the law, belonged to Esau as the elder brother, yet the Almighty here reveals his purpose to give the superiority to Jacob, the younger. His right is supreme: He can give to whomsoever he will. He can lift up one and cast down another, for He is the Judge: He is above all law and custom, and no one can dispute his authority or impugn his wisdom. The record does not furnish us with the reasons why God gave the promise of preeminence to Jacob; but the character of the two brothers, as subsequently developed, together with their conduct and

and that of their posterity respectively, are sufficient to show us that the Omniscient One, in his thoughts and ways, had no need to be instructed of any creature, and that infinite wisdom directed and controlled all the arrangements of his Providence. Let the divine promise to Rebekah of Jacob's superiority be distinctly borne in mind, since it serves to clear up much that would otherwise be obscure in the subject. What eventually came to pass was only in accordance with the purpose of God. The end occurred altogether as it was designed. The thoughts and plans of human actors were disappointed, whilst at the same time improper and sinful means were employed by Rebekah and Jacob to bring about a fulfilment of the promise, which no correct judgment can approve, but which must ever be strongly condemned.

A second circumstance, which it is most important also to take into account, is Esau's selling his birth-right to Jacob. So little did he prize the primogeniture, the privileges of the first-born, which consisted in his "inheriting a double portion of the estate, his becoming the priest of the household, and his exercising an authority over the younger members of the family, similar to that which was possessed by the father," that he foolishly and wickedly sold these for a mess of pottage, "a morsel of meat." He was more under "the influence of sense and appetite, than of reason and religion." There was more of the carnal than of the spiritual element in his nature. He lightly esteemed those blessings which the Almighty had covenanted to give to Abraham and his posterity, "not only in respect of the land of Canaan, but also in respect of the Messiah who would arise from among them, and all the religious advantages connected with this distinction." He sold all these for a mere trifle, whilst a proper appreciation of them would have led him to esteem them as above and beyond all price. And so promient do his unbelief and folly thus become, that the epithets "profane person" and "fornicator" are applied to him in the New Testament.

"What profit" says Esau "shall this birth-right do to me?" He thought, when he came in faint from the field, that he was going to die; but why should he have inordinately craved Jacob's pottage? Why would not other food that the house might have furnished answered his purpose as well? Why was he so intent upon having *this*, that he would obtain it at all hazards? Surely it shows that he cared but little for his birth-right, when he was willing to part with it for a morsel

of meat, for the mere gratification of a carnal desire! It exhibits indeed "a selfishness, and a prudence which approached to cunning on Jacob's part, to have proposed the purchase of the birth-right. But so far as Esau is concerned, it is manifest that he was sadly deficient in the estimate which he made of the value of his privileges. A willingness, on any account, to sell such an exalted honor, a readiness to part with it for such a paltry consideration, as a morsel of meat, and to solemnize and ratify the transaction with the oath, surely was enough to show that Esau verily "despised his birth-right." So that, whilst Jacob eventually received the blessing, which under ordinary circumstances would have descended to Esau, *Esau nevertheless was not wronged in regard to the birth-right.* For both the purpose of God contained in the promise to Rebekah, and his own agreement, entered into with Jacob and ratified with an oath, had deprived him of all claim to it. Despising it, he deserved to lose it.

In the next place it is proper to observe the respective preferences of Isaac and of Rebekah for their children, as preparing the way for the stratagem which succeeded in securing the paternal blessing for Jacob. Isaac, the record tells us, "loved Esau, because he did eat of his venison." Esau had "a strong predilection for the bold and daring enterprises of the hunter." He was a Nimrod in his tastes and habits, and he had acquired such skill in the pursuit of game, that he was styled "a cunning hunter." The father delighted in him, because he was accustomed to bring home from the fields "savory meat" with which he could regale himself. And his instructions to him, preparatory to the dispensation of the blessing were, that he should take his weapons, his quiver and bow, and go out to the field and take him some venison, that savoury meat such as he loved might be prepared for him. Such a circumstance as this does not seem to be a very fitting bond of strong sympathy and affection. It partakes too much of the carnal and earthly; and especially does the preference on the part of Isaac appear strange, when it is considered that Jacob had many lovely features of character, and that the divine purpose was to give him the supremacy.

It was Isaac's design to give the blessing to Esau. He intended to proceed according to the law of the country, forgetful of that "higher law" which God had made known to Rebekah, namely, that "the elder should serve the younger."

His faith here seems to be weak. He either was not deeply impressed as he ought to have been with the Lord's revealed purpose, or knowing it, he was not properly influenced by it. But the Almighty interposed. Isaac was defeated in his intentions. The word and promise of the Lord Jehovah prevailed. And Isaac was soon led to see his error, and to confirm more fully the blessing to Jacob, in accordance with the divine will.

As for Rebekah, she "loved Jacob." Jacob was "a plain man dwelling in tents." His avocation was that of a shepherd. His manner of life was simple and unpretending, and "he found in the flocks and herds, which he kept, images and emotions which both filled and satisfied his heart." He seems to have had a loving disposition, and a warm affection for home. His pursuits were better calculated to develop the more quiet, domestic virtues, and to bring him into closer communion with the household, than the avocation of Esau; and thus he became greatly endeared to his mother, who had for him "a peculiar regard and an undisguised preference," and who, perhaps, had no conception of the lengths, to which this fond attachment would carry her, and of the evil and bitter consequences which could hardly fail to flow from it.

Moreover there was that in the domestic arrangements of Esau which served to cause alienation between himself, on the one hand, and his parents on the other. Esau had married two wives "who were a grief of mind unto Isaac and Rebekah." And the thought that the paternal blessing should descend to him, and that he, with his wives, should be placed over the house, was more than the fond Rebekah could endure, and, therefore, when the patriarch was about to bestow his final blessing, she interposed to secure it for Jacob, whom she loved, and to prevent it from falling on Esuu to whom Isaac proposed to give it.

And yet further Esau had already sold the birth-right, and consequently he had no claim upon it now. And, taking this fact in connection with the promise which the Lord had made to her, Rebekah was encouraged to hope that Jacob would surely become heir of the blessing; so that the mother, when she found that it was still intended, on the patriarch's part, to make Esau the favored one, was deeply impressed, as she had good reason to be, with the thought that her husband was about to act most improperly; and she could not rest content without interposing to frustrate the *human*, and

to promote the *divine* purpose. So far as this was her moving and controlling impulse, it was most commendable. But alas, much appears in what now occurs, to present both Rebekah and Jacob in an unenviable light.

We are thus conducted to a consideration of the means employed to obtain the blessing for Jacob. The old and infirm patriarch, preparatory to the bestowal of his final benediction, had bidden Esau to go out and procure him savory meat. Rebekah had overheard his command, and became aware of what he intended to do. She spake to Jacob, communicating what she had heard, and enjoining upon him to obey her voice, she commanded him to bring her two kids of the goats that she might make savory meat for her husband, which Jacob was to take to his father that he might eat, and thus that he might procure the paternal blessing for himself. Jacob objected to the proposed measure as *impolitic*, he was afraid that he should be detected and be put to shame for trying to impose upon his feeble father, through the infirmities which age had produced, and that he would thus provoke the patriarch to curse instead of to bless him. This is the way he reasons: "Esau is a hairy man, and I am a smooth man, peradventure my father will feel me, and I shall seem to him as a deceiver." He did not seem to see the criminality of the proceedings. He looked more at the impolicy of the thing, and on this ground he felt like halting. But the mother still further interposes, and with an unwarranted boldness, proposes to take upon herself the curse of her son, whilst she still urges upon him implicity to obey her voice. Jacob yielded a reluctant obedience. The kids were brought and prepared. Rebekah took goodly raiment of Esau and put it upon Jacob, and she put the skins of the kids of the goats uqon his hands and upon the smooth of his neck, and she gave him the savory meat to take to his father, all that the infirm old patriarch might be deceived, and that what he thought in his blindness he was giving to Esau, might really be obtained and appropriated by Jacob.

Thus prepared, Jacob approaches his father. He personates Esau, and he professes to the patriarch that he *is* Esau. He plays the hypocrite, he acts the liar's part. The patriarch feels him, that he may be convinced of his identity, that he may know that it is indeed his son Esau who is before him. "The voice" says he "is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau." As his eyesight had failed, he also distrusted his hearing. He allowed himself to be persuaded that the

voice which he heard was not Jacob's, though it sounded much like it; and so he discerns not the cheat which is being practiced upon him. Again questioning, he again receives the assurance, "I am Esau;" and partaking of the meat, he blesses him who brought it, blesses Jacob, who personates Esau, in deception and falsehoods, and thus the stratagem, planned by the mother and executed through Jacob as the instrument, proves entirely successful.

Now what is to be said of these things? In the first place, Rebekah's conduct in regard to the means she employs for accomplishing her purpose is, in the highest degree, reprehensible. She had a promise from God. As a believing woman she should have been content with that, and given herself no uneasiness about its fulfilment. She should have persuaded herself that He who had spoken was fully competent to bring to pass what he had said He would do. Although there was much that looked as though the divine assurance was not to be fulfilled, in the preparation which Isaac had ordered, and in the declaration which he had made, she still ought to have remained unshaken in the faith, knowing that while "man proposes, God disposes," and believing with her whole heart, that even in her extremity God would find his opportunity. "She ought either calmly to have argued the case, and expostulated with Isaac; or, if that appeared inexpedient, to have committed the whole matter to the Lord by prayer, and by no means have used any artifice on the occasion."

The *conduct* of Rebekah cannot, by any means, be justified, though the *motives*, by which she was actuated, were no doubt of the most worthy character. She could not bear to see her husband pursuing a course which, she was perfectly sure, was in opposition to the divine purpose. She was jealous of the honor of the Most High. She was earnestly desirous of seeing his own promise established, and in so far, she was moved by the most worthy impulses and sought the most worthy ends. She was right in feeling concerned about God's purpose and promise; but she was not right in the mode in which she gave expression to her feelings. Her error was more an error of the head than of the heart. She should have sat down calmly, and left God's ways to unfold themselves, without undertaking to assist their development, especially in the use of reprehensible means. She should have permitted God, so to speak, to have his own way, and not have attempted to find out a way for Him. She

should have remembered that man sets himself up in vain against the divine arrangements, and that He who sitteth in the heavens will take care to vindicate his own honor upon the earth. Alas, in the agitation which seized Rebekah, in her being "troubled about many things," she let go, for a season, her confidence in her strong-hold; she over-reached herself, she was conducted into great sin, and she was made to see it afterwards, and, to her own confusion, to reap the bitter fruits of it. How much better is it to trust with unquestioning faith in God's promises, than to lean upon our own wisdom.

Again, behold what an unhappy influence Rebekah exerted upon Jacob, by the course she thus pursued! How highly culpable was she in this! Not content with sinning herself in this matter, she so influences Jacob as to bring him in, as an aider and abettor of her sinful designs. By all the earnestness of a mother's entreaty, and by all the authority of a mother's commandment, she induces her own son to become a prominent actor in the unworthy and unjustifiable scheme, by which the patriarch is foiled, in what he attempted to do, even though it was in contravention of God's purpose and promise. It is mournful and humiliating thus to behold a mother conspiring with a son in wrong doing, thus making use of her own offspring as a tool for the accomplishment of her evil designs. But whilst we look with feelings of sorrow and pity on the picture here, let us not forget that the great consideration which induces her to act thus is, zeal for the honor of Jehovah, an earnest desire to see his promise fulfiled and his purpose accomplished, a circumstance which though it does not justify or excuse her conduct, is certainly to be regarded as a palliation of it.

In what a sad light too is Jacob presented to our view in this transaction! Is he not also "to be blamed?" Can he be guiltless? Is he to be justified? Whilst the great burden of the sin lies upon the mother, Jacob is by no means free from it. What were the means by which he compassed his end? Were they not deceit, downright falsehoods, hypocritical taking advantage of the patriarch's infirmities? And are such things right? Can any possible circumstances attending them give them such a character? Will the teachings of the divine Word countenance, justify or sustain them? The whole artifice, as planned by Rebekah, and carried out by Jacob was wrong, sinful, wicked both in conception and

in execution. The end ultimately aimed at was indeed good, but that was God's matter. Neither Rebekah nor Jacob had any warrant thus to seek to take out of God's hands what belonged exclusively to him. In so far as they did this, they are to be condemned, in so far as their zeal betrayed them into sin, they were in the highest degree culpable. Can they be justified in these things? Justify them and you have the unholy maxim vindicated, "The end justifies the means." Then will men have ground and encouragement to say to each other "let us do evil that good may come," Then may demagogues proclaim with reason as their watchword, "Our country, right or wrong." Then may we steal, in order to put money into the Lord's treasury. Then, in a word, may we do all manner of evil, if we can only persuade ourselves, that we have a good object or end in view.

We must then be careful, in this case, to separate between God's purpose and the human means and agencies which were improperly employed to bring it about. Jacob received the paternal blessing. The younger son was indeed exalted above and preferred before the elder. The divine promise was fulfiled. God had his own way, despite the designs and desires of the patriarch. But let us by no means suppose that God sanctioned the human arts, contrivances, and falsehoods by which it was effected. It could have been done, and it would have been done without human intervention. The Almighty in some way, though no one may be able to tell how, could have frustrated the purpose of Isaac, inasmuch as it was in conflict with his own. He is not dependent upon the poor help of man. His purposes are not affected by human intervention, either to help them on or to hinder them. In his own time and way, He will always do that which He has covenanted with his people to perform.

So far then as God is concerned in this matter, we are to look at the promise and fulfilment only. His word was made good. So far as the agencies which Rebekah and Jacob brought to bear in the matter are concerned, agencies into which their zeal, untempered by knowledge and uncontrolled by a strong faith, betrayed them, we can do nothing else than condemn. These were manifestly wrong, sinful. God is a God of truth and uprightness, and He can never sanction or encourage deception and falsehood in any degree, or look upon them with the least measure of allowance. So far as Isaac and Esau are concerned, we see how God rules. The patriarch was foiled in his endeavors to accomplish im-

proper ends. Esau, who had shown himself unfit for the supremacy, by his habits, by the alliances he had formed, and by his profane contempt of the birth-right, was deprived of the paternal blessing. And God's way prevailed, the younger was made to rule over the elder. Jacob was significantly named, the *supplanter*.

That God was not an unconcerned spectator of this whole transaction, and that he did not withhold his judgment respecting it, we may plainly see, "in Isaac's trembling and consternation which followed, when Esau came in with his savory meat, and in the subsequent discord in his family, in Rebekah's anguish, when she heard of Esau's murderous intentions, for he said, 'the days of mourning for my father are at hand, then will I slay my brother Jacob,' and in the sorrow with which she parted with her beloved Jacob, probably no more to meet with him on earth, in Jacob's tedious exile, and great and many hardships, and in his fear long after, that enraged Esau would smite the mother with the children."

Thus God brought all those, who acted in this discreditable transaction, bitterly to reap the fruit of their own rashness and wickedness. His purpose stood, but the unwarrantable human interference for its accomplishment met with a just recompense. Evil doing will never prosper. It will always bring, sooner or later, a harvest of shame; even though it be undertaken with good motives and for the best purposes, it will be sure to meet with the frown of a righteous God.

That Jacob might be fully established in his possession of the blessing, and that it might not be deemed invalid, seeing that it had been procured by fraud, Isaac subsequently confirmed it with all deliberation. Gen. 28: 3, 4. And Jacob went forth in the fulness of the blessings of the covenant, possessing the land, and growing with a mighty nation, out of which, in due time, the Messiah came.

Thus we behold, in a memorable illustration, how the counsels of the Highest prevail. Thus we may learn the utter impotence of man to forestall the divine purposes and plans. Thus may we understand the folly and wickedness of bringing in unholy human arts and contrivances to make good the divine declarations; and thus may we see the importance of holding fast to the Almighty in the unshaken confidence, that He will not fail to bring to pass what his mouth has spoken.

# ARTICLE V.

## JOHN GOTTLIEB FICHTE.

Translated from Hagenbach's Church History of the XVIIIth and XIXth centuries, viewed from the stand-point of Evangelical Protestantism.

By Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, A. M., Erie, Pa.

*Fichte till his appointment as Professor in Jena.—The Fichtean Idealism.—Charge of Atheism.—Fichte in Berlin.—Return to the religious stand-point.—"Directions for a blessed life."—Fichte's last days and death.*

In the village of Rammenau in Upper Lusatia, John Gottlieb Fichte was born, May 19th 1762. His father was a linen weaver, and himself gave the child his first instruction, when the loom was standing still and the garden work was accomplished, exercising him in reading, teaching him religious passages and hymns; very likely relating to him many things of his travels through Saxony and Franconia and thus awaking aspirations for great things in the infant mind. As the boy grew older it became his duty to read the daily, morning and evening, prayers in the family circle, and then already the father perhaps cherished the silent hope of one day hearing his son preach in the village pulpit. In the mean while the pastor of the place interested himself in the aspiring boy, being particularly pleased with the evidence of a good memory, given by the unhesitating repetition of a sermon which the child had heard. This talent brought him into favor with a noble lord also, in whose presence he was at one time called on to repeat a sermon, and who was so pleased with the performance that he promised to attend to his education from that period, and committed the boy to the charge of a country clergyman near Meissen. Here Fichte laid the foundation for the ancient languages. In his twelfth year he entered the city school of Meissen, and a little later the school Pforta by Naumburg, in which Klopstock was educated and which has sent forth so many great Germans. The monastic seclusion, which had already aroused many a young heart in that school to resistance, became to him exceedingly oppressive and at last awakened in him the thought of se-

cret flight. He actually fled with the intention of becoming a second Robinson Crusoe, but on an open hill, not far from the school, in the midst of a prayer which he offered to God for his deliverance, he was struck with sorrow for his undertaking; an inner voice bade him retrace his steps, and he voluntarily returned. His sincere repentance not only procured him pardon but also milder treatment.

From the youth of Hamann and others we learn that the one-sided instruction, which at that time prevailed in most of the German schools, confining education almost entirely to the study of the ancient languages, was especially the system of the celebrated school Pforta. The so-called real sciences were not studied, nor polite literature; the German poets were read only by stealth, the solid Haller alone was used. In this clandestine manner Fichte, among other works became acquainted with Lessing's polemic treatises against Gœtze; and now perhaps that polemic dart was sharpened which he afterwards, in the spirit of Lessing, hurled against his enemies. About Michaelmas 1780, Fichte entered the university of Jena, for the purpose of studying theology, but, although he preached at various places with success, eloquence was not natural to him; he was therefore soon absorbed in philosophical studies.

Being deprived of all help from others, he was obliged to provide for his future course himself, and then his good star led him to us in Switzerland by means of a tutor's situation which was offered him by the landlord of the "Sword" in Zurich, who desired to give his children more than a common education. Here Fichte sometimes preached in the city, as well as in the neighboring country; here he made the acquaintance of Lavater; here, too, originated a love affair with the lady whom he afterwards married. She was the daughter of Rahn, the Keeper of the Public Scales, and the niece of Klopstock. In the meanwhile, however, Fichte felt himself obliged to seek his support in some other place and being supplied with letters from Lavater and others he returned to Germany. In this unsettled pecuniary condition which drove him as far as Poland, he was continually studying more and more thoroughly the Kantian philosophy, whose devoted follower he had become. He did not rest until he became personally acquainted with Kant. He went to Königsberg, visited the Philosopher at his house and attended his lectures as a transient auditor. But he found himself satisfied neither at the one place nor the other. The reception at the

house was cold, the discourse in the lecture-room was drowsy. Still Fichte remained an enthusiastic disciple of the critical philosopher, and soon, as an author, became a representative of the Kantian system. "The attempt at a critique of all Revelation," ("Versuch einer Kritik aller Offenbarung,") appeared, a work. in which the Kantian principles, in reference to the possibility of an extraordinary Revelation, are applied with masterly skill. It excited great attention. In public criticisms Kant himself was mentioned and praised as the author. Even to the minute parts of the work, it was thought that traces of Kant's style were discernible, until, finally, Kant declared that he was not the author, but a certain candidate of theology, Fichte, who was at that time tutor in the family of the Count of Krakow in West Prussia. This was the first thing that made Fichte's name renowned in Germany, but with the renown rose also a number of opponents and enemies, and the aspiring intellect was drawn into those confused literary contests, out of which even the matured mind never comes fully. In the midst of these contests Fichte traveled back to Zurich and consummated his marriage there, in the fall of 1793.

"Half of my soul," so he writes to the lady while yet on the journey, "we will make the indissoluble covenant of virtue, as soon as we shall see each other again; we will be to each other the staff and support in the path of virtue; we will remind and admonish each other when either becomes forgetful; for * * * * * I have resolutely determined to be an *upright man in the full sense of the term*, and for this I shall often have need of your assistance." The marriage took place in Baden, Argovie; and Lavater who was at first expected to perform the ceremony, but who resigned it to J. G. Schulthess, made the bridal couple rejoice with congratulatory verses.

About this time Fichte made the acquaintance of the author of "Lienhard and Gertrude," who, still living in retirement at Richterswyl was reflecting on his first essays on popular education. Pestalozzi and Fichte were pleased with each other and continued during life to be friends. In later years, Fichte said with enthusiasm that in Pestalozzi's system of education was to be found the true remedy for sick humanity.* Fichte, at first lived at Zurich in the house of his father-in-law, in the happiest relations. Here he was

*In his "Reden an die deutsche Nation."

occupied from without with the great commotions, produced by the revolution, and from within with the further development and completion of his system. At the solicitation of Lavater he delivered philosophical lectures before the public of Zurich, and Lavater himself, however little might he be able to reconcile his own mind to the philosophical train of Fichte's thoughts, was one of his first and most enthusiastic auditors. A proof this is, of the freshness of Lavater's mind, and of that high, true liberality which at that time brought into close relation men of the most different modes of thinking, because the presentiment of something better, which was aimed at by all parties, and the pleasure in seeking, was greater than the dissatisfaction experienced from transient contradictions. Later than this, when Fichte was already persecuted on account of atheism, Lavater wrote to him out of the spirit of Fichte's Philosophy the following lines:

> "Unerreichbarer Denker! Dein Dasein beweist mir das Dasein
> Eines ewigen Geistes, dem hohe Geister entstrahlen!
> Könntest je du zweifeln, ich stellte dich selbst vor dich selbst nur,
> Zeigte dir in dir selbst den Strahl des ewigen Geistes."*

Fichte was taken from the friendly relations of Zurich society by a call to a philosophical Professorship at Jena. His wife remained at Zurich for some time. With his appearance at Jena commences Fichte's public activity as teacher in the higher sense. Jena was at that time the centre of modern erudition. Here lived and taught Schiller, whose acquaintance Fichte had made previously and who shared with him the admiration for the celebrated Kant, and from this place he entered into a relation with the Weimarians, Wieland, Gœthe, Herder; and made acquaintance also with Jacobi, Humboldt, the brothers Schlegal and others. Youth flocked to Jena from all regions. Swiss, Danes, Coulanders, Livonians, Poles, Hungarians, and Transylvanians, also several Frenchmen sat at the feet of the German teacher, to receive as it were the inmost spirit and kernel of science, with the *Wissenschaftslehre*, as Fichte called his Philosophy. Fichte fully felt the greatness and importance of his position as Academical teacher. He is perhaps the first since the days of the Reformation, who has properly comprehended the du-

*Unattainable Thinker! Thy existence proves to me the existence of an Eternal Spirit from whom radiate noble spirits! Couldst thou ever doubt I would only place thee before thyself, show thee in thyself the ray of the Eternal Spirit.

ties of such a teacher. His influence upon the students was not intended to be merely scientific, in the common-sense of the word, not merely learned, not a merely literal performance, which in case of necessity might be accomplished by letter. He was no dictating machine, he knew the power of the living word, and of personal intercourse. He desired to influence the Academical youth in a manner morally ennobling and intellectually inciting; to teach them to comprehend the calling and end of the learned from the highest and noblest point of view; to elevate them above common and every-day affairs and lead them to the ideal. He desired less to lead back into the antiquity of the past than to prepare, with poetical inspiration, a more beautiful, more powerful future. In this striving Fichte had much in common with Schiller. In Fichte's Lectures on the "Bestimmung des Gelehrten" and similar writings as well as in his letters we find the same morally impelling and purifying power, which we have recognized in Schiller's poems. But with this moral ideality was connected a bold transcending of what had been handed down from other ages and of the positive, a certain defiance which the youth were apt to regard as an expression of the feeling of moral strength, which was, however, viewed with suspicion by reflecting men and by those in authority. A cotemporary and admirer of Fichte (Forberg) says: "The spirit of the Fichtean philosophy is a proud and daring spirit for which the sphere of human knowledge is too small; it strikes out a new course every step is takes, struggles with languages in order to wrestle from it words to express the fulness of its thoughts; it does not lead, but seizes and forces us along, and touches no object without crushing it. * * * * The distinguishing mark of Fichte's character is the highest integrity. Such a character generally knows least about delicacy and gentility. * * * * His discourse therefore roars like a thunders-storm, which discharges its fire in separate strokes. His imagination is not vivid, but energetic and powerful. He penetrates the lowest depths of his subject, and moves about in the realm of ideas with a freedom which shows that he not only lives, but actually reigns in this invisible realm."

In reference to the effect, which Fichte's Lectures produced upon the students, the same observer remarks: Fichte is believed in, as his predecessor Reinhold* had never

*Reinhold forms the transition from Kant to Fichte in the History of Modern Philosophy. It is a remarkable fact for an historical purpose, that Rein-

been. He is, of course, understood much less, but on this very account is believed more obstinately. I and not = I, Ich und Nicht=Ich (the characteristic words of the Fichtean philosophy) are now the symbol of the philosophers of yesterday, as in the time of Kant and Reinhold, matter and form were. * * * * Fichte intends to effect the world by means of his philosophy. *The inclination to restless activity, which dwells in the bosom of every noble youth, is carefully cherished and nourished by him*, that it may produce fruit at the proper time. He is continually inculcating that action! action!* is the object of man, from which it is to be feared, that the majority of the youth, who take this to heart, will regard the summons to action as nothing else than a summons to destroy. Besides this the sentence is false. Man is not created to act; if he cannot act without doing wrong, he ought to remain inactive. Thus far this observer. Let us add to this, what Fichte says of himself: "The principal object of my life," he writes to Miss Rahn, is, to avail myself of every kind of improvement (not scientific, for I find much vanity in that,) of character, which my condition will possibly permit. I study the course of Providence in my life, and find, that this may also perhaps be the plan of Providence in reference to myself, and I have, in general, found, that all the occurrences of my life have made my character more decided * * * * * I have too little talent to insinuate myself into any one's favor and to deal with persons, whom I do not like; I can only get along with good, honest people, am too frank and unfit for court. * * I am as little fit to be a learned man by profession, as it is possible to be. I want not only to *think*, I want to *act;* I like least of all to think about trifles. * * * * I do not seek happiness; I know that I shall never find it. I have only one passion, only one want, only one full feeling of self, to effect that which lies without me. The more I act, the happier I feel."

hold proceeded from the Catholic Church, but by means of philosophy found his way into the Protestant Church, and indeed, the development of modern philosophy generally, till Schelling, belongs to Protestantism, and first since then a Catholic speculation has planted itself beside the Protestant. Reinhold was such an enthusiastic admirer of Kant, that he remarked, "After a hundred years he would have *the reputation of Jesus Christ.*"

*Schelling in one of his lectures says: "Action! action! is the cry which resounds from all sides; it is mostly, however, raised by those who cannot get along with knowledge."—Tr.

We thus find, from the testimony of others and of Fichte himself, that he was not so much in pursuit of thought as of action, and we might therefore expect a philosophy, which impels directly to action. But we would deceive ourselves greatly, if we expected a practical philosophy, i. e., a philosophy of life, intelligible to all. There was no lack, at that time, of such practical philosophies; but that of Fichte was the farthest removed from these. What Fichte terms "action," is not action after the manner of a camp, an industrious activity; nor the quiet action of philanthropy for the public good; it is action, which is intended to effect others definitely, to give the world a new tendency, a new impulse; transforming, reformatory, perhaps even revolutionary action; not, however, in a blind, hap-hazard manner; it is not to be mere agitation, but rather action, resulting from our deepest convictions and from the consciousness of the highest personal freedom. And *this* consciousness again was connected in the most intimate manner with Fichte's philosophy. This philosophy was not the fruit of mere thinking; it forced itself on him as he struggled for the truth. However abstract and unpopular, therefore, it may appear to those, who are not accustomed to the technical language of speculation, with Fichte it was the fruit of the noblest and greatest moral struggle; it was deeply rooted in his heroic, I might say Titanic, character. This was the very thing which made it so accessible to the young men, even where they understood but half, had but a faint presentiment of the truth and were amazed. This was also felt by the opponents. They knew very well, how to discover the revolutionary, which was contained in Fichte's mode of thinking and was thrown like an electric spark in the minds of the youth, and it was probably quite a right conjecture of Fichte, when he supposed, that it was not so much his atheism, which frightened the people, as his democracy which, at this time of political excitement in the neighboring country, appeared doubly dangerous. Since, however, the theoretical and practical were most intimately connected in him; since his unusual thoughts aimed at unusual actions, it was natural, that the one should be watched in and with the other. Before we see why and how the grievous charge of atheism was made against him, we shall have to give a picture of his philosophy, as far as the nature of these lectures allows:

I shall, however, here first give some extracts from Fichte's letters to his wife, which show how he was regarded by the

students, how highly he estimated himself, how boldly he spoke about matters and things, and how firm he thought he stood with the government, in spite of his opponents, while soon after it was quite different. "Last Friday," he writes, May 26th 1794, "I delivered my first lecture. The largest lecture room in Jena was too small, the entire entrance-hall, the yard was full, on desks and benches they stood over one another.* * * * * It is true, that the students had a general prejudice in my favor, which I certainly did not destroy by my presence. My lecture, so far as I have heard, has been received with universal approbation. When I deal with them personally, I am very friendly and courteous, place myself on an equal footing with them, and thus win their confidence. * * * * My relations to my colleagues are also very pleasant. I can now say more confidently, that all have received me with open arms, and that many worthy men are seeking my special company. * * * * I keep myself in a certain state of candor, am kind, open and friendly to all."

Further on he writes: "The course has opened favorably. Respect among the students and a certain decorum, also create respect among the professors, ministers, etc. The Duke conversed with me a long time. Gœthe continually shows himself a warm friend of mine. And I have reason to believe, that the duke himself would rejoice in being able to do something for me."

Then again: "Be careful not to believe it, if some of these days it should be written to Zurich, that I have been called to an account in Weimar for my teachings, that I have been prohibited from writing this or that. * * * * In all Germany I am now the subject of general sarcasm, and everywhere strange reports are spread about me. This, however, is very fine; it shows that I am not altogether disregarded. The truth of my relations to our government is this; unlimited confidence is placed in my integrity and prudence, and plain hints have been given me to teach entirely according to my convictions and that I shall be defended powerfully against all injury."

And in another letter of July 21st: "You look at the German sovereigns very strangely, through your Zurich spectacles. What your aristocrats would do, *if* they had the power, that you expect from ours, because they *have* the pow-

*So it was, at one time, also with Melanchthon at Wittenberg.

er. The only difference is, that ours are not quite so stupid, as yours. You are like the cow-herd boy, who desired to be king, so that he might be able to besmear his bread with as much syrup, as he wanted; just so your aristocrats judge, and the rest of you look through their spectacles. * * * No one shall injure me, of this I assure you in few words. I offer no weak side, *and I have heart and courage.*"

In order to estimate the Fichtean philosophy and its influence on the Protestant Church and theology, which indeed was only transient, so far as it agrees with the object of these lectures, we must commence with Kant, whom Fichte at first joined, with the greatest enthusiasm, till going beyond his master, he announced his system, which in its essential principles contradicted that of Kant and produced a rupture in the philosophical school, which, to this hour, is not healed. I must, however, here remark, that it cannot be my purpose, to give a scientific representation of Fichte's system, just as I have not given such of Kant. This must be left for the history of philosophy, from which we only take what is necessary for our purpose. For this reason we must refrain from passing a judgment on the Fichtean philosophy itself; for we would only be entitled to do this, if we were able to examine the connection of the system with Fichte's personality, and the internal organic connection of the system itself. We only speak of the *impression*, which the system has left in the consciousness of the Church, and of the commotions it has occasioned; and therefore only form that conception of it which is necessary to comprehend, to some degree, that impression and those commotions.

As Kant started from this, that the knowledge of man is limited by space and time, and that he can know nothing of God and divine things by means of the *pure* reason, whilst as amends for this he denoted God and immortality as requirements of the *practical* reason; above all, however, he represented *morality*, demanded by the categorical imperative, as the essence of all religion. So Fichte, too, first of all, placed himself on this subjective stand-point of restrained and limited human knowledge. According to him, too, we do not know the essence of things, but only as they *appear* to us in our present condition. But whilst Kant accepted a real world objective to man, and only made the conception and contemplation of the same dependent on the arrangement of our knowledge, Fichte went farther, in the course of time, in this namely, that he regarded the entire objective world itself

as a product of the human mind, as a reflection of the creations of the mind, which originate and move in us, either unconsciously or consciously. Nothing had reality for him, except the *Ego* (Ich), or the *consciousness* which, however, he did not think as something resting, idle, but as a continual act, as a creative power. In opposition to the plain, common sense of man, which simply insists, that there is a world and in it a multitude of things, perceived by our own senses, and of which we afterwards make representations (images) in our minds, he asserted, that there are representations, images in us, which we first attain unconciously, and then through continued thinking. Man first *creates* the things in thinking, represents them to himself, places them before him by thinking, and in so far they exist for him. First of all the consciousness forms itself in man, or, in Fichte's words, the Ego sets (fixes) itself," (das Ich setzt sich selbst). This is the first act of our consciousness (or the first act of which we are conscious). With this connects itself the second act of our conciousness, namely that the Ego (I) can also think that, which differs from it, which is not Ego, Nicht—Ich. "The Ego sets a non-Ego" (das Ich setzt ein Nicht Ich). Of this non-Ego (not I) man, however, knows only, that it is the contrary of Ego. It is nothing which has a real, independent existence (out of our minds), nothing material, substantial, having extension in space. That which appears to us, as matter or as substance, is rather only a momentary checking of our thinking (just as the momentary congealing of a stream). That, too, which we call spirit, is not a substance, something conceivable out of us; therefore Fichte avoided the expressions of spirit and soul, because by these we are apt to understand something itself spiritless, something dead, substantial or ghost-like. He withdrew himself simply to the Ego which, however, as already remarked, must not be thought as a resting, existing Ego, as one receiving its impressions from without, but as a productive power, a continually active and creative Ego. According to the above, it was quite consistent, if this Idealism, this philosophy of the Ego, sought to remove from our notion of God, all that might remind us of any thing material or substantial. Even the Scriptural expression, "God is a Spirit," was not fine and spiritual enough for our philosopher, since by spirit might easily be understood a personally restrained, hence a limited, being. Therefore Fichte says: "God is not *Existence*, but pure *Action*, just as I too am not existence, but pure action. God ceases to be

infinite, as soon as He is made an object of an idea, as soon as He is to be represented definitely to our minds, is to be comprehended. Every conception of God is an Idol. If we abstract all that limits God, all that makes Him comprehensible to us, there remains for us a Being quite incomprehensible, pure Consciousness, Intelligence, spiritual Life (without any farther definition)." Thus Fichte finally found no other expression for denoting God than the Ego, in so far, of course, as it is not conceived as limited, personal, individual, but as an *absolute* Ego, transcending all finiteness and limitation. He also called it the *moral order of the world.* It would certainly be doing Fichte injustice, to interperet his system to mean that he wanted to make himself, J. G. Fichte, God. Against this he protested most solemnly, and it always requires little art, but on that account a more hateful disposition, to draw such conclusions from premises, which are not understood in their connection with the entire system. We might say with more propriety that Fichte, like Spinoza, rather denied the existence of the world, than of God; that he *apparently* denied the existence of God, in order to conceive Him very spiritually; for he did not want anything to be attached to the Creator, which is created and drags him down into the sphere of the finite. This attempt to spiritualize may even have a deep religious ground; it arouses from indolence the thinking mind, which is to apt to think of God in an anthropomorphitic manner, or which properly thinks nothing, but simply repeats thoughtless words and formulas, of which it can give no explanation. Fichte was not the first, who attempted this intellectual soaring. Former thinkers, and, indeed, very Christian men among them,* had to submit to the degradation by the masses of what they gave as the expression of a mind, struggling for proper ideas of God, to common-place reflections and wilful misrepresentations or ignorant distortions. It was said of many, that they did not believe in God, because they did not conceive Him as materially and plainly, as the masses. At the same time there is something dangerous in this striving, even if it may proceed from a noble disposition; for it may finally happen that by means of this diluting and spiritualizing process, every thing will really vanish in mist, and that from the pure beholding of the sun the eye will more and more envel-

*We need but to think of Origen and his opponents, or of J. Scotus Erigena and the later sects of the Middle Ages.

ope itself in darkness. We ought certainly, to be conscious of the fact, that we, as men, can only know God in a human manner, that all our expressions in reference to Him are figurative and do not correspond to His nature; but since we are men, limited beings, we ought in humility to use the language, adapted to our wants and of which God himself was not ashamed, when he condescended to reveal Himself to us. Let those philosophers, therefore, who attempt to lead man beyond himself into a region, in which even our inner senses disappear and where we can no longer have a footing, be accountable, if, without regard to the impression which it makes upon other minds, they speak a language, necessarily subjected to misunderstanding on account of its remoteness from other human language; and they must also submit to the opposition, which their bold speech occasions. Fichte was a teacher of Academic youths. At his feet sat many who were destined to proclaim to Christians congregations the God of the Gospel; a God, who is only Creator, if there are creatures of His creation, who has called a world into being, not as a visionary, but as an actual, a real world; a world, in which sin, misery, and affliction appear but too real, from which the mere *imagination*, that they do not exist, can not save us, but which can only be removed by a higher reality, a divine fact, by God's act of love, as it appears historically in the redemption through Christ. If now the ground were taken from under the feet of those destined to proclaim such a doctrine, if nothing religious remained for them, but their miserable Ego, of which they were not even as fully and energetically conscious, as Fichte of his, must not many just scruples have arisen in the minds of those too who were not accustomed to restrain the freedom of investigation hastily? A difficult question now arose which since then has frequently been asked and which is, indeed, founded in the twofold nature of Protestantism, Whether for the sake of learning free course shall be gixen to free investigation and a free publication of the results of the investigation, or whether restrictions shall be made for the interest of the Church, to which also belong the weak and the young. We call it a difficult question, because we do not like to give our unconditional approval to one side or the other. What would claim approval in one case, might deserve blame in another. Where the acts are not finished, it is easy to do injustice to one or the other party. From a predilection in favor of learning, faith may be wronged, and from a zeal for the faith investigation

may be improperly opposed; and if this difficulty is great even to an honest mind, it must be doubly so, when passions are excited on both sides. It may almost be conjectured, that it was so in the process against Fichte, which threw him out of the midst of his very brilliant career. Fichte was charged with no less an error than *atheism*, and to this day the learned are not agreed, whether this oft-abused term may be applied to Fichte's system as represented in his Wissenschaftslehre. To this must be added, as Fichte himself remarks, that his democracy was as much a thorn in the eyes of his opponents, as his atheism. The fact, that he disregarded all established customs, offended many. He chose Sunday, for the purpose of delivering moral lectures to the students. In this the Consistory of Weimar, of which at that time Herder was a member, thought they recognized the secret intention of gradually undermining public worship, although Fichte protested solemnly against this, and appealed to the example of Gellert, whose moral lectures had also been delivered on Sunday, and to the fact, that the theatre in Weimar was opened on Sunday, and why not then the philosophical lecture room?

This dispute about reading lectures on Sunday was, however, only the prelude to a fiercer contest. Fichte published a work, "On the grounds of our Faith in the Divine Government of the World," in which the moral order of the world was denoted as God and the assertion was made, that we need and can conceive of no other God. "The existence of *this* God cannot be doubted; it is the most certain of all things and the ground of all other certainty; but the idea of God as a particular substance is impossible and contradictory. It is proper te say this candidly, to strike down the prating of the schools, so that the true religion, of doing right cheerfully, may be elevated." Many pious minds, of course, took offence at these expressions. Although Fichte might be satisfied with this moral order of the world, *the Christian's faith in God*, a faith too, in "doing right cheerfully," but at the same time in a real God, it could by no means be content with this philosophical theory. This faith would not, however, have been destroyed by this theory, even if no interdiction had been issued against it. Such an interdiction appeared. The book, in which Fichte advocated the theory of the divine order of the word, was attacked in the Electorate of Saxony, and from this place the attention of the court of Weimar was called to the dangers of Fichte's

doctrine, "as one, not only openly hostile to the Christian, but even to natural religion." In the written requisition of Dec. 18, 1798, it is said: "Since experience teaches sufficiently, what mournful consequences, for the general welfare and especially for the safety of the States,* result from the tolerance of those unholy efforts to increase the inclination (already too prevalent) to infidelity, and to banish the ideas† of God and religion from the hearts of men; therefore we cannot be indifferent in reference to our land, when teachers in neighboring countries openly and fearlessly avow such dangerous principles." The government of Weimar was therefore called upon by its Saxon neighbor, "to punish the author of the essay, according to his desert, and in general, to make such strict arrangements, that similar mischief may be checked powerfully in the University of Jena and also in the Gymnasia and other schools;" to which was added the threat, that if this was not acquiesced in, the Electorate of Saxony would forbid its children the privilege of visiting the University of Jena. Similar summons, to prohibit the circulation of the accused writings, were sent to the other Protestant courts. Hanover complied with the request, whilst Prussia, which ten years previous had issued the strict religious edict,‡ refused to acquiesce. Yes, it was Prussia, which kindled the first ray of hope in Fichte, that, if he was driven from Saxony, he would find a retreat in its States. And this actually occured. Fichte, however, having made an appeal to the public, anticipated a formal dismission, by handing in his resignation, which was accepted.

Encouraged by the Prussian minister Dohm, Fichte went to Berlin, where he arrived on the first of July 1799; and when the king (Frederic William III,) was informed of the fact, he replied: "If Fichte is so quiet a citizen, so far from all dangerous alliances, as I understand him to be, I

*Hinc illae lacrimae!

†What confusion, in speaking of *ideas*, which are to be banished from the *heart!* Ideas are only banished from the head, but therefore religion does not depend on ideas. *She* would first have to be banished from the *heart*, which no human philosophy can ever accomplish. The heart indeed may become corrupt, when the head is giddy or confused; but then the remedy does not consist in ideas, the renovation must commence with the depths of the heart, and this is only done by the Spirit of God.

‡July 1788, by Fred. Will. II, against the errors of Socinians, Deists, Naturalists and others, which were spread under the name of "Enlightenment." Tr.

willingly grant him a retreat in my States. It is not the business of the State to give a decision in reference to his religious principles." According to Fichte's own letter to his wife, the king should even have said: "If it is true that he is at enmity with God, then God may decide the matter with him, it is nothing to me;" a mode of expression, which brings to memory Frederic the Great. Enough! Fichte, relying on the word of the king, spent the summer and autumn alone in Berlin, and then also brought his family thither from Jena. The letters, which he wrote to his wife from Berlin, plainly bear the marks of mental disquietude, arising from inflicted injustice. The following expression is valuable to give us an idea of the state of his mind at that time: "*Since I have no humility*, I suppose I shall have to be *proud*, so as to have something, to bring me through the world." The impression, which Fichte's appeal to the public made on his friends, was various. Whilst some placed him by the side of Luther, whose lot they thought he shared, and pointed to the legions, who would assist him in the cause of enlightenment; others used the occasion, to turn Fichte's thoughts to himself, and to remind him, that his fate was not altogether uncalled for, but that it was rather the *philosophical* intolerance, which had called forth the political as a counteraction. To these sincere and well-meaning friends Lavater belongs. In this matter, as in general, he despised the interference of rough physical force with the contests of the intellectual powers. "Where there is light (so he wrote to Fichte on the 12th of Sept. 1795), there is also opposition from without; where there is life, there the more lifeless revolts, by means of number and coalition. This we all experience! Every day I see more clearly, that internal power excites external force against it, that positive force is eternally warring against natural, real, inherent power. As the flesh opposes the spirit, so the world (the force of number) opposes those minds which disregarded this force. Your condition and your philosophy, what a contrast! O, my dear friend! through what morasses and contrasts we must work our way." We have already seen how he turned off the charge of atheism, which was made against Fichte in a poem, by pointing to Fichte's personality. Now, however, after Fichte's appeal to the public had appeared, Lavater wrote him on the 7th of Feb. 1799, the following: "Your heart loves the truth, even if your understanding must look with a kind of pity down upon mine, which cannot touch the low-

est part of yours.* My first feeling was that of compassion, because you were attacked with such a dictatorial spirit, that no questions were first asked of you personally in reference to your opinions, and that the course of a worthy humanity was not taken. But, permit me to say it with the same openess, I was somewhat displeased to read so many sharp and little remarks against your opponents. Do you not think, my dear Sir, that it would have been better for your person and the cause of good, if you had treated them somewhat more gently and had done more justice to their intentions? * * That is (at present) beyond all doubt the *prevailing*, which the *oppressed Church suffers! It is evidently the prevailing philosophy, by which the Church is oppressed.* In what does the prevailing philosophical Church distinguish itself from every common, orthodox or hierarchical Church? Certainly not in tolerance and indulgence, certainly not in mildness and forbearance against its opponents, who scarcely dare open their mouths any more! What volumes of inhuman judgments, prostitutions, low insults and cruelties might be gathered for publication! How often has this been represented to the critical philosophers, and what good has it done? And, let me say it freely, your very appeal is far from being free from this harshness and intolerance." And now Lavater declares with all frankness that his (Fichte's) God was not the God of Christianity, not the God, whom humanity needs or is prepared for. * * * * "There is (he writes) among a million men scarcely one, who can jump beyond himself so far as to think or even feel the least, at the contemplation of such a God as yours. And a God, in the contemplation of whom we can neither think nor feel the least, is not only no God, but for those, who thereby think and feel nothing, an absolute non-entity."

Fichte did not receive this letter of Lavater's very favorably. He thus expresses himself in reference to it to the philosopher Reinhold: "Lavater has also written me. Besides the common misapprehension of the true meaning of philosophy, he has also still a faith, founded on authority, in Christ, Paul, etc., or to speak more properly in his *Zurich Interpretation of the Bible*, which makes it impossible for me to correct his ideas. I answered him briefly, that he did not understand me, and promised him a more detailed answer

*Literally which does not reach to the heels of your understanding.—Tr.

which, on account of my disgust of the entire affair, I shall likely have to owe him forever."

This unfriendly position, which the so-called scientific stand-point assumed in reference to that of faith, continually became more hostile to Protestant Christianity, and we suffer from it to this day. It seems as if men did not want to understand each other, but desired to make the variance and chasm continually greater, instead of healing the difficulty; and yet it is remarkable in the case of Fichte, that after he had removed himself farthest from the common Christian feeling, he was led nearer and nearer it again. It was the very settlement in Berlin, too, which prepared a crisis for Fichte's inner life. The younger Fichte says of his father: "The deeper reflection of the spirit on itself, the proper completion and last maturity in his system and views of life begin with the epoch, when he, free from all the pressing of prevailing and opposing opinions, unconcerned about the approbation or rejection of others, occupied himself only with self-cultivation. * * * * A *religious* manner of contemplating the world afterwards manifested itself in him, rendering him milder and solving many difficulties; and this manner of contemplation he embraced with no little confidence and power." Fichte himself, in the course of time, did not wish, that the conflict had not occurred, for it had become the occasion to him of penetrating to the living fountain of inner invigoration. A conversion in its common acceptation, i. e., a complete return to the orthodox doctrines of the Church, or a surrendering of his speculative stand-point, and a withdrawal to the purely devotional and practical can not be expected from a mind like Fichte's, much less a jumping from one extreme to the other or a sudden change of his language. Nor would much have been gained by this, either for Fichte or the cause of truth in general; for, however, much danger for practical Christianity accompanied the increasing speculative tendency in Germany, still we will not deny, that in it was manifested a freshness and quickness of spirit, which pointed to a revivification of the religious ideas, to an approaching spiritual regeneration of all religious thinking, "The thought of a living God," says the younger Fichte, "delivering man from the servitude of imperfection, and the will from the Tantalus labor of an endless struggling, by means of the knowledge of the truth, that by Him the *good will, humility and love* are taken for the deed, this simple thought, which had formaly been active in faith and ex-

perience, was far removed from the education of that age. For the recovery of this thought, the sanction of science and high mental improvement was necesary, both of which had torn themselves from faith." It is thus a remarkable fact, that the very idealism of Fichte, which led him to the abyss of atheism, had to serve the purpose of leading to the deeper fundamental ideas of Christianity, to the idea of an entire yielding of the soul to God and of the blessing, which lies in the communion with God, in this life already, in opposition to the dry intellectual view of God, and of opposing to the one-sided *moral* stand-point, which had been adopted since Kant—one truly *religious*, in the deeper sense of the word.

After Fichte had again called attention to the deep importance of faith, in the book "Die Bestimmung des Menschen," which was published in Berlin at the close of the last century; after he had pointed out the importance of Christianity, "as the only true religion" in history, and the great importance of the Christian State in the "Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters," he attempted, especially in his "Anweisungen zum seligen Leben oder Religionslehre," a course of popular lectures, delivered in Berlin 1806, to prove the agreement of his philosophy of that time, with the principles of Christianity, which he regarded in a light entirely different from Kant. Kant and the Rationalists placed the essence of Christianity chiefly in morality and the fulfilment of the moral law and, in accordance with this, esteemed and used with a special predilection those passages of Scripture, in which the various moral precepts are drawn in distinct outlines, as for instance the Sermon on the Mount and several Parables of Jesus in the first three Gospels (whilst they had no taste for John, who appeared to them a mystic); Fichte on the other hand, threw himself on the fourth Gospel and regarded it as the only true source of the genuine doctrine of Christ; he of course did this in a one-sided manner and with a denial of the other truths of Scripture, which belong fully as much to the totality of Christian doctrine and history as the Gospel of John.

"Only with John," says Fichte, "can the philosopher agree, for he alone has regard for reason, and appeals to the proof, which the philosopher recognizes—the *inner* proof. 'If any man will do the will of Him, that sent me, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.' * * * * The other announcers of Christianity build upon the external

demonstration through miracles which, to us at least, proves nothing. Besides this, of all the Gospels, John contains what we seek and need, religious doctrines, whilst the best, that the others give, is, without making up the deficiencies and interpreting by John, nothing more than *morality, which has a very subordinate value with us.*" With these last words, Fichte renounced most decidedly Kant and the Kantian Rationalism, and turned towards Mysticism, which values the inner abiding relation to God infinitely more than the accidental and transient manifestation of the disposition in the external relations of life. Whilst, however, he again brought the Gospel of John to honor, he could, as little as the Rationalists, or perhaps still less, agree with the Christianity of Paul; he denotes it in the most incomprehensible manner a *degeneration* of all Christianity, and why? Because Fichte, with all his approach towards that which is Christian, ignored entirely the nature of sin and the contrast between sin and redemption, which Paul holds up so prominently, and expected salvation only from a direct union with God, a union boldly jumping over the contrast by an ideal leap. "Christianity (he says, in contradiction to Paul) is not a means of reconciliation or of expiation; man can never separate himself from God, and in so far as he *imagines* himself separated from Him, he is a nothing, and therefore can not sin, but around his brow the oppressive illusion of sin only places itself, to lead him to the true God." Here of course he might have learned from John, if he did not want to hear Paul: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," (1 John 1: 8).

The immediateness of the relation between Christ and the Father, as it is especially represented in the Gospel of John, was taken by him as the expression of the relation that should exist between God and man generally. And this was right. He, however, took that which *ought* to be, and to which man can only come by purification after much struggle, and through connection with the Redeemer, (for it has not yet appeared, what we shall be) as already present, and in this again shows himself an Idealist, i. e., unpractical and unhistorical. Nevertheless it may produce a peculiar interest to follow a thinker like Fichte, in a time, which had turned away to a great degree from the fundamental truths of Christianity, and to see, how he arrayed Christianity so as to suit himself; how he again returned with his language to the Christian mode of expression; how he, without being com-

pelled by any despotic command from without, through which he would never have suffered himself to be forced, was constrained to give the honor to eternal truth; and although much of that which Fichte proclaimed as Christianity was still controlled by the ideas, and expressed in the language of the school, we shall nevertheless feel a milder air blowing around us, than that which blew against us so sharp and cutting from the Wissenschaftslehre. The only real entity (Sein), these are the principal thoughts in his Religionslehre, is the Absolute or God. This absolute entity (Sein), however, is not only, does not remain hid in itself; it has also an *existence* (Das ein) that is, a revelation, a manifestation of itself. God reveals himself in us, in our consciousness, and it is only the multifarious, much divided world, which draws us from God; we ought, however, to compress the eternal One (das ewige Eine) into a great focus of our spiritual life. This we can do religiously by faith, scientifically through the idea. Our finite Ego must take up in itself the absolute Ego by faith and by thought, and in this intimate union consist salvation and eternal life. Fichte expresses himself in a simple and comprehensible manner, in reference to this matter, thus: "Do you want to see God face to face, as He is in himself? Do not seek Him beyond the clouds; thou canst find Him, wherever thou art. View the life of those who are devoted to Him, and thou beholdest Him; yield thyself to Him, and thou findest Him in thy breast."

If we remarked before, that Fichte regarded morality as something subordinate, he meant that morality, which estimates the value of actions more according to their external signification, their use in the world, etc. He very properly opposed this morality of expediency and the Pharisaism of work-holiness, and showed, from the true Protestant standpoint, how all depends on the *inner* disposition with which we act and on the *faith*, whence these works proceed. In this respect he was not so far from Paul, as he generally appears to separate from him. "Religion," he says,* is not mere devotional dreaming, it is not a business which can be followed on certain days or at certain hours, independent of other business; but it is the inner Spirit, which penetrates all our * * * * thought and action, and immerses them in itself. * * * * It does not depend on the

*His expressions, too, in reference to the free will, in his addresses to the German nation, are entirely Pauline.

sphere, in which one acts. * * * * To him who has only a humble vocation, this humble vocation itself is sanctified by religion, and through it receives, if not the material, still the form of the higher morality, for which nothing more is necessary, than that we recognize and love the will of God on and in us. He who tills the ground in this faith or performs the most unpretending manual labor with fidelity, is higher and happier than he, who without this faith (if this were possible,) would bless humanity for a thousand years." Luther had said something quite similar, that the servant, who sweeps the street, can do it in faith; consequently in a manner pleasing to God. This is the morality of subjectiveness, as Christianity (in direct opposition to ancient heathenism) and as especially Protestantism requires it, and here we find Fichte on the right foundation. Let us add to this a few more of his expressions, which agree perfectly with the very essence of the Gospel: "Love is higher than all reason, is itself the source of reason and the root of reality, the only creatress of life and of time; * * * * she is, as in general, the source of truth and certainty, so also the source of *perfected* truth in the true man and in his life." "The living life is love, and, as love, it owns and possesses what is beloved, is embraced and penetrated by it, blended and mingled with it and is eternally one and the same love. * * * In so far as man is love, and this he is in the root of his life always, he remains ever and eternally the one, the true, the eternal, just as God himself, * * * * and it is not a bold metaphor, but literal truth, what John says: 'He that dwelleth (remains) in love dwelleth (remains) in God, and God in him.'" "Salvation itself consists in love and the eternal peace, produced by love, and is unaccessible to reflection; conception can only express it negatively (can only say what it is not). It cannot be described positively, but can only be felt immediately. Doubt makes us miserable, drives us hither and thither, and spreads out before us an impenetrable night, in which our feet can find no safe path. The religious man is eternally freed from the possibility of doubt and uncertainty. He knows definitely every moment, what he *wills* and *ought* to will. Since for him the inmost root of his life, his will comes undeniably always from Divinity, whose nod is infallible, and for that, which the nod indicates, he has an unerring eye. He knows certainly every moment what he shall know through all eternity, what he wills and ought to will, that through all eternity the fountain of divine love,

which has been opened in him, will not become dry, but will preserve him and lead him eternally. This fountain is the root of his existence; it has beheld it clearly and his eye is fixed on it with deep love; how could the former ever dry up, how the latter ever turn in another direction? Nothing occurring around him, surprises him. Whether he comprehends it or not, of one thing he is certain, that it is in God's world, and that in this there can be nothing, which does not tend to good. He has no fear in reference to the future, for the absolutely Blessed is ever leading him towards it."

If now we ask, how did Fichte consider all this as brought about by Christianity, we shall find, that the person of Jesus had with him a signification, entirely different from that of the Rationalists. He does not behold in him the teacher of morality, nor simply the moral example. No, exactly that oneness with God, as Christ expresses it in the Gospel of John, exactly that *real unity with the Father*, which the Rationalists desired to remove as a metaphysical formula of no use to morality, was to him the heart and the star of the Gospel. On this account he held himself so closely to John and his doctrine of the Logos, having become flesh, in which he beheld the fulness of all religious knowledge. We would however, make a great mistake, if from this we concluded, that Fichte agreed with the old orthodox doctrine in reference to Christ. What this doctrine regarded as an historical fact, which had occurred once, that Fichte regarded as a fact eternally repeating itself, as occurring in every religious man. Christ was not the *Saviour* to him in the old sense; He was only the representative of that, which is continually occurring still. "The eternal Word becomes flesh at all times, in every one, without exception, who understands, in a living manner, his oneness with God, and who really yields his entire individual life to the divine life in him, * * * * quite in the same manner as in Christ Jesus." It is true, Fichte acknowledges that the insight into this absolute unity of human existence with the divine did not occur *before* Jesus; but this is a matter of indifference to him, a mere *historical* observation on which but little depends. "Is any one united with God," he says, "then it is all the same in what way he became so; and it were a very useless and wrong occupation continually to repeat the remembrance of the way instead of living in the matter." We think, however, that it is of great value to know this way, and Fichte

himself acknowledges, that all those, who since the time of Jesus have come to a union with God, have only done so through and by means of him; yes, "till the end of time (this is Fichte's honest and open confession) all the sensible will bow low before this Jesus of Nazareth, and all will humbly acknowledge the exceeding glory of this great 'phenomenon.'" He, however, thinks that Christ himself does not lay the same stress in this recognition, as the Church. He thought like Herder, that in case Jesus (as human individual,) would return to the world, He would be perfectly satisfied, if He only found Christianity prevailing in the souls of men, whether his merits were praised in connection with this or were disregarded; "for this is in fact the least," he says, "that could be expected of such a man who already when He lived on earth sought not his own honor, but the honor of Him that sent Him." Fichte is quite right in saying that Christ did not seek this honor for his own sake; and we, too, believe, that a *living* Christianity, even with many dogmatical errors in reference to the person of Jesus, yes, even with a partial denial of this personality is better, than that orthodox repetition of "Lord! Lord!" without the proper spirit and proper disposition. But Christ and Christianity, person and matter, the historical and metaphysical, can not be separated* as arbitrarily, as Fichte seems to suppose; hence love, which Fichte himself has so beautifully and enthusiastically given the pre-eminence as the essence of all religion, the more it obtains the predominance over the prejudices of the understanding, will involuntarily turn again to the person, from whom it proceeds and because it is *personal* love, love to *Christ*, it will become deeper and more fruitful.

At all events, Fichte has the merit of having directed the attention to the soul of religion, and of having freed it from the servitude of mere morality. Although so many, and even orthodox Christians, had conceived eternal life only as future, as in another world, and though Kant had founded the faith in God and immortality, chiefly on the necessity of a retribution in another world, Fichte placed eternal life (quite in accordance with Scripture) in this, that we know God *here*, love him and feel ourselves united to Him in blessed communion; and this living in God was to him even in the

*This arbitrary separation still belongs entirely to the stand-point of the Kantian Rationalism.

earlier period of his life, before speculation had grown too strong for him, the sure guarantee for the future, just as it again became the same in his later years. Already in 1790 he had written from Leipzig to Miss Rahn: "Our understanding is too small to be a dwelling for Divinity, for this our heart only is a worthy house. The safest means of assuring ourselves of a life after death, is this: to lead such a life here that we can desire a future one. Whoever feels that, if there is a God, He must look down upon him graciously, is not moved by any arguments against His existence and needs none for it. He, who has sacrificed so much for virtue, that he can expect amends in a future life,* does not prove and believe the existence of such a life; he *feels* it. United, my dear helpmate, for this span of life and for eternity, we will strengthen this conviction, not by proofs, but by actions." Thus too, he despises, in his "Anweisungen zum seligen Leben," the prospect of a refined, sensible prosperity in another life; because it rests on egoism, on personal self-love. The love of God, however, is to exterminate self-love; it is alone to fill the heart and where it fills the heart, it is already in this world the source of salvation. It does not depend upon the circumstances in which we live, here or there; God, who is to-day what he will be in all eternity, wants to make us happy through himself, and thus there is no eternal life without Him, either in or beyond this world, except in him. Fichte, as well as Schleiermacher after him, showed that there may be such a thing as an immoral and irreligious faith in immortality, such a one, as seeks only itself in the other world, not God. "This mode of thinking, expressed in the form of a prayer," says Fichte, "would run thus: 'Lord, my will only be done, and that, indeed, during all, and on that account blessed, eternity, and for this Thou shalt have Thy will in this short and miserable temporal life;' whilst the truly pious pray thus: 'Lord, Thy will only be done, and by this means mine is done, for I have no other will than this, that Thy will be done.'" We shall afterwards see, how this disposition could degenerate to a resignation of pride, which is very different from Christian submission, and how the sentence, true in itself, that eternal life is to commence here, was perverted into this, that it is *only* to be had here. It was very important that in opposition to the torpidity of the moral re-

*Here of course Kantian makes its appearance, but modified by adopting immediate feeling.

ligious disposition, into which a great part of the cotemporaries had sunk, the attention was directed to the great importance of this life especially when so powerful a personality, as Fichte's, assisted in making the impression deep. And now we will turn our attention again for a moment to this personality.

With all the ruggedness and angularity, which we encounter in Fichte's conduct, his high nobility of mind cannot be denied. Fichte's character proves itself Protestant,* reformatory, not only in the sphere of thought, but especially in that of life and morality. Just as he knew how to check the rudeness of student life and was anxious to prevent duels by instituting courts of honor, so too, in times of political distress, he was one of the first, who attempted to raise the sunken national feeling again and "to inspire the disconsolate with courage and hope." He aimed at this in his fine "addresses to the German nation," which he delivered in the University of Berlin in the winter of 1808–1809, whilst his voice was often drowned by French drums, passing through the streets, and when well-known spies were present in the lecture-room. Several times even the report was spread through the city, that he had been seized and led away by the enemy. It is not the place here, to enter more closely into an examination of the contents of these speeches, or to follow the active part which Fichte, in his last days, took in the German war for freedom. We will only refer to it, so as to render the picture of the man complete.

Fichte expected the greatest blessings from a better education, one which not merely brings the command to be virtuous from without, but strengthens the will by love. "The rosy morn of the new world," he exclaims among other things, "has already appeared and gilds the mountain tops, and prefigures the day, that is to come." Fichte did not live to see the longed-for day of freedom. In the newly founded University of Berlin, he could not act but a short time longer, as teacher, In the spring of 1808, as he was about to commence his philosophical lectures, he was attacked with a dangerous sickness, from which he, however, recovered. Afterwards there were many interruptions by the pre-

*His philosophy was called by Fr. Schlegel, Protestantism carried to its farthest results. And that Fichte himself believed in a further progress of Protestantism, in which progress he felt himself a powerful agent. See "Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters," p. 412: "The drama of the Church-reformation is by no means finished."

parations for war; in the meantime he had begun his Lectures in the winter of 1813, when in 1814 his wife was attacked with a contagious disease. She had incurred the disease through the Christian faithfulness, with which this excellent woman, principally urged to it by her husband, tended the sick soldiers in the lazaretto. With the greatest sacrifice and care Fichte now devoted himself to tend and nurse her. One evening he had already bid the unconscious sick wife farwell, in order to lecture at the University, had lectured two hours in succession on the most abstract subjects with the greatest self-control, and had returned home with the thought, that perhaps he would find her dead, just as a favorable crisis appeared and the physicians began to hope for the first time. The wife was saved, but it cost the life of the husband. The next day Fichte felt quite unwell, and soon the true nature of the disease became evident. He still received the account of Blücher's crossing the Rhine, and the rapid advance of the allies into France. This inspired his spirit once more with bold hopes, and the joy, occasioned by the news, so mingled with his feverish fancies, that he imagined himself taking part in the battle—his whole life, what had it been but a warfare, with the sword of the mind in his hand! When shortly before his death his son approached him with medicine, he gave him the significant answer, "Never mind that, I need no more medicine, I feel, that I have recovered." In the night of Jan. 27th, 1814, Fichte died, not quite 52 years old, but in unimpaired strength of body and mind. His wife survived him five years, and was buried, as she had requested, at the feet of her husband, in the cemetery before the Oranienburger Gate, Berlin. A high obelisk marks the place, with an inscription from Daniel (12: 3.): "The teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." How far these words of the prophet are applicable to Fichte, as a philosophical teacher, of course, depends on the judgment formed of the moral and religious contents of his system. This had, as we have seen, several grades; first, it only appeared as a consistent continuation of Kant; then, it manifested itself as perfected Idealism, dismal and ghostly, and rendered more gloomy by the suspicion of atheism; finally, however, the setting star turned itself with greater brilliance towards Christianity, and although not in the form of a full, unreserved Evangelical confession, as had been the case with some

other Christian philosophers, still in a mode of philosophical thinking belonging to the Christian sphere. And this Christian knowledge might become to some the means of passing over to a simpler faith, to that righteousness, of which the prophet, in the above passage, refers. If, however, as we have already observed, Fichte is to be estimated, not merely as a philosophical author and as a man of the school, but also as a man of common life, then this cheering trait may yet be mentioned from his life in the home-circle, that in the house of the distinguished philosopher each day, without exception, was closed with proper and solemn evening devotions, in which the domestics were also accustomed to take a part. After several verses had been sung from a choral-book, accompanied with the clavichord, the father of the family would make some remarks on some passage of the New Testament, most frequently on his favorite Gospel of John. In these discourses he was less concerned about moral applications and rules of life, than about freeing the mind from the distraction and vanity of the common affairs of life, and elevating the spirit to the eternal. That this produced beneficial effects on the members of the family and also on those less closely related, the son of Fichte testifies to, from his own experience; to whom we are also indebted for most of the knowledge of the Life of his father.

## ARTICLE VI.

### A CALL TO THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.*

By Rev. H. L. Dox, Lockport, N. Y.

The Christian Ministry was instituted for the propagation and practical enforcement of the Gospel. Though not founded upon it, as a Profession it is in perfect accordance with that principle which under-lies the general organization of society, *the classification of labor*. The well-being of every community depends upon the successful prosecution of a

*Discourse, delivered at the opening of the Franckean Evangelical Lutheran Synod, Argusville, N. Y., June 6th, 1861, and published by unanimous request of Synod.

number of occupations, each calling in requisition a distinct class of qualifications. Whatever a man's capacity and aptitude may be, he cannot fit himself for every sphere of activity; and were this possible, without ubiquity he could not perform the numerous services which need be going forward at the same time. A person who should resolve to do everything himself, to conduct without aid the almost endless list of avocations, necessary to the comforts of life, would be sure to find use for more then one pair of hands and more than one set of faculties; while he certainly would accomplish but little any where, and that little very imperfectly. The presumption is that man may find ample scope and occasion for his capacity and his time in any one legitimate calling, and where society is properly constituted and competition is not ruinous, that one will afford him an adequate support. And hence the propriety of the ministry as a distinct profession.

But, as has already been said, though in strict harmony with it, the ministry is not based upon this great principle. Christianity is not part of the original plan, by which the wants of our nature were to be supplied. It is a special provision to meet an extraordinary emergency. And whatever is peculiar to it partakes of the same nature. It has special objects to accomplish, special obstacles to overcome, and, of course, to be adapted, the means must also be special. And such is their character. Nothing in nature can take the place of the Spirit. Nothing in literature can be substituted for the Bible. The functions of no other office, nor of all others combined can embrace the purposes of the ministry. Motives, prompting to ordinary spheres of activity, grow out of the ordinary demands of the race, and the force, with which they appeal to particular minds, depends upon the nature of encouragements afforded and qualifications required. But whoever enters the ministry, being in itself a specialty, must be controlled by special reasons, as it is a suggestion of common-sense, that the service to be rendered should be allowed to determine the character of the motives which lead to its performance. The conclusion therefore is, that, while a man may consult his natural tastes and personal interests, whether he will devote himself to husbandry, the mechanic arts or some other branch of professional life, he must determine whether he will preach the Gospel, by deciding whether God has specially called him to this work.

That this is clearly the teaching of the Bible, perhaps no one will doubt. How strangely such language would sound if applied to any other occupation! Should we hear a person saying, "Woe is me if I till not the soil, if I cultivate not the fine arts, or if I do not engage in commerce, we should certainly conclude that he was indulging a mirthful propensity or that he was in a condition bordering on insanity. There are indeed those who might say that *necessity* is laid upon them to engage in some particular employment, as their sustenance depends upon their labors, while they are capacitated for nothing else. But it was in no such sense the Apostle used this language. He did not mean to say that he was under some physical or economical necessity to preach the Gospel, and that the woe of want and starvation would come upon him if he refrained from it. He meant that God had imposed this work upon him as a duty, and that as a Christian man he could not excuse himself from it; that he was not at liberty to confer with his own preferences or personal interests, that the requirement was imperative and to refuse to perform it would be rebellion. In a word, he meant that he was just as much bound to be a minister, as he was to be a Christian, to preach the Gospel as to practice it.

This then is the doctrine of Paul respecting the ministry. It involves a *special*, a *Divine* call. And this is the doctrine, which, however, differently modified and expressed by different individuals, is substantially accepted by all or nearly all branches of the Christian Church. It would be easy to define the idea of such a call more precisely and more fully to illustrate its truthfulness, but our present purpose is to inquire more particularly, *In what does this call consist?* or in other words, *How may a person know whether he is called to preach?*

The entire subject must certainly be capable of clear apprehension and of an intelligent statement. It is important, equally to those who preach and the Churches they serve, to know whether they are properly in the sacred office or intruders there; whether they are mutually to expect the blessing or the curse of God in assuming the relation of pastor and people. There must therefore be some personal characteristics, some facts in experience by which, beyond the reach of reasonable doubt, one may become satisfied himself and satisfy others that the Master requires him to labor in his vineyard. *What then are some of those characteristics and facts?*

I. A Call to Preach presupposes Gifts. Natural endowments lie as the foundation of all progress in mental and moral culture, and are the only instrumentalities, upon which direct dependence can be made for relative usefulness. That God not only makes use of the "weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty," but even "the things, which are not, to bring to nought the things that are," is indeed a statement resting upon high authority. But we have no reasons for believing that he ever has or that he ever will employ persons who are radically defective in constitutional balance and vigor, as the chosen ministers of his word.

In naming several of those *gifts*, the absence of which must be sufficient indication that a man was not intended for the ministry, we shall mention,

1. *Common Sense.* And by this should not be meant, merely that a person possesses some capacity, it may be, some intellectual brilliance; but we should understand by it a *sound practical judgment.* It implies a mind, capable of deciding upon the nature and relative importance of things with discriminating accuracy. The assumption, that God has invested those with the functions of the sacred office who are unable to distinguish the different shades of character among their hearers or to select subjects suitable to occasions, is a shameful reflection upon his infiinite wisdom. He surely requires no man to rear the superstructure of a personal character, with the materials of even the foundations of which he has not been furnished. We should not insist upon such an elevated view of this gift as to leave none in possession of it but the children of genius, while at the same time care should be taken not to sink it below that grade of intellectuality where nothing but imbecility is found. The judgment of the masses may be regarded as a tolerably correct test on this subject. The man's mental density is above suspicion, who is unqualifiedly endorsed by public opinion. While those, who are always arrayed against the established sentiments and usages of the great majority of their fellow-men, are justly liable to suspicion and ought to suspect themselves. To this rule we ought perhaps to make two exceptions. The one is that of persons, possessing such elevation and breadth of intellect as to place them beyond the range of ordinary minds. The other is a class who, though not wanting in depth and force of mind, are constitutionally eccentric, and always seeing things from points of observation occupied by no one else,

and accordingly obtaining views altogether peculiar to themselves. Of the first there are but few, and no better evidence of the want of *common sense* can be afforded than the arrogation of that rank. Eccentricity is a misfortune, if it is not a fault. The eccentric man may have sense enough, but the kind, being peculiar, is not only not available for many of the purposes of life, but exceedingly troublesome in every respect. God may call some such men to the ministry, but as they are exceptions themselves, they cannot be judged by general rules.

2. *Susceptibility of Cultivation* is necessarily embraced in every rational view of a call to the ministry. There is a type of mind, of which very little development may be expected. And there is another type having, it may be, remarkable expansiveness and aptitude in some things, but very deficient, or possibly entirely wanting in these qualities in every other direction. There are, for example, some good general scholars, who are yet so destitute of musical endowments, that the most thorough and protracted training would scarcely enable them to distinguish one note from another. Now we may not presume that God makes choice of any one, as an ambassador of the cross, who is not capacitated for every class of culture which is needed to prepare him for his calling. No spontaneous growth of the faculties, no miraculous bestowment of ability may be anticipated. Here, as elsewhere, God employs the gifts of nature, and requires us to make use of the ordinary means of improving those gifts with a view to the accomplishment of his purpose. Grace is granted to aid nature only where and when such aid is indispensable. Accordingly, whoever ignores the importance of mental discipline upon the presumption, that he can make dependence upon an instantaneous inspiration, is an object of pity rather than hope, while if he has been driven to this conclusion by fruitless educational endeavors, any impressions which he may cherish, that the Gospel ministry is his vocation, only the more certainly proves him to be the victim of self-deception.

3. A call to the ministry presupposes a certain grade of *Communicative Faculties.* No matter how rare and costly the jewel, while locked up in the casket, its beauty can never be admired, its value never appreciated. The sealed fountain sends forth no sparkling waters, either to dance in the sunlight, promote the growth of vegetation or refresh the thirsty traveller. And the most treasured truths, however,

thoroughly digested and methodically stored away in the mind, will never edify the Christian convert nor lead the dark-minded sinner to Christ. The preacher must be able to express his thoughts and emotions in all their varying forms and modifications; to express them clearly, attractively, forcibly. It is not enough that he can write intelligently or even elegantly; he must, either with or without his manuscript, convey his sentiments and feelings to other minds orally, so as to interest and make himself understood. It is true that this faculty is susceptible of wonderful cultivation. And this fact must not be overlooked to the injury of those who are entitled to our sympathy and encouragement. When the mind is full of matter and the heart all on fire with enthusiasm, the tongue, that is dumb, can scarcely refrain from speaking, while if it be touched by the talismanic power of a persistent discipline, it will at length wax eloquent and the slow of speech will become a son of thunder. We must not forget Moses whose plea, that he could not speak well, was unavailing with God; nor Demosthenes whose untiring application conquered even natural obstructions and placed him before his own nation and the world, a model of eloquence. It has been supposed that the "thorn in the flesh" of which the apostle Paul complained, was a stammering tongue, but allowing the conjecture to be correct, it did not, though a source of great anxiety, relieve him of the necessity which was laid upon him to preach the Gospel, while the grace vouchsafed to him was sufficient to crown his labors with abundant success. Indeed, our own observation must be all convincing on this subject. Who has not known persons, unable at first to utter with propriety two consecutive sentences, finally distinguish themselves by their masterly oratorical performances? But while all this, and more, is true, we must yet insist upon what was first asserted. A certain grade of communicative ability, natural ability, must exist as the foundation of all hope of improvement. He who can never learn to talk will never be fit to preach.

4. The last item to be noticed is *Taste*. By this we mean a *sense of fitness*, or the perception of what is right and proper with regard to manner, times, occasions and classes of individuals. The connection between *Ethics* and *Æesthetics* between the morally right and the morally beautiful, between propriety and efficiency, is much more intimate than many seem to suppose. In fact, taste and conscience perform the same functions, only in different departments. And if the

lack of the former is not so fatal to personal piety, it is scarcely less deplorable in the effect upon one's usefulness. An elevated taste imparts grace to goodness and beauty to holiness. And no one needs a nicer discernment of what is befitting different occasions and the distinctive shades of social refinement than does the minister of Christ; and no one should be more prompt in his discoveries or versatile in his habits to avoid awkward blunders, which excite disgust, and an unbending stiffness which is sure to repel. Neither a massive intellect, nor a flashing genius, the force of logical arrangement nor the facination of eloquent utterance; neither the originality, which startles, nor the flights of imagination which bewilder, can compensate for the want of good taste; if indeed such qualities and performances can exist without it. In fact the great object of the ministry can hardly be secured without a tolerable degree of this qualification. A man must gain hearers as well as get something to say to them, and he must interest before he can instruct them. And as a general thing, the *manner* of delivering a discourse is more important with a view to effect than the matter or the arrangement. The frame work of an argument or an appeal may be faultless; but, in consequence of the airs of the preacher and his style of utterance, instead of convincing the understanding or moving the heart of the hearer, it may be listened to with inattention or rejected with disdain; while every one knows that the best pulpit efforts may be counteracted by uncouth bearing on the street or boorishness in the parlor.

These then are some of those characteristics which in the ministry are indispensable; and it is the height of presumption to suppose that God calls any man to it who neither has nor is capable of acquiring them.

II. Our next Proposition is, that a *Call to the Ministry presupposes Grace.*

No furniture of the mind can be accepted as a substitute for the fruits of the Spirit in the heart. However richly endowed by nature and polished by education, the work of grace must be superadded to authenticate a Divine call. Between the conditions and tendencies of the Christian and the carnal mind the contrast is too decided to tolerate the thought that the difference may be overlooked in the choice of a shepherd for the Lord's flock. It is neither in accordance with reason or revelation to suppose that the agency of enmity may be employed to excite love, or the influence of darkness to produce light. "If the blind lead the blind,

both will fall into the ditch." It is indeed as true in the moral as in the physical world, that antagonisms mutually effect each other; but the effect is repulsion, not attraction. Affinities are established only between natures, which are homogeneous, and the only hope of preventing evil or reforming from it, is to bring the evil-doer under the influence of positive good. But it is not so necessary to insist upon the fact itself, that God does not employ wicked men to preach his word, as to notice some of the reasons of that fact. Of these there are three which briefly claim our attention.

1. *No unregenerate man, from proper motives, will seek the work of the Gospel minister.* By its legitimate object, our sinful nature will never be allured or controlled. If a sinner will not come to Christ, that he may have life, he certainly will not engage in his self-denying service for the purpose of bringing honor to his name. The profession, it is true, is not without its attractions even to those who know nothing of the constraining love of Christ. Ambition may feed upon its prominence; pride may be gratified with its notoriety; a taste for literature may be captivated by its advantages; admiration of oratory may feast upon the desire for its performances; the love of ease and the love of lucre may alike, by improper misapprehension, fancy it as a field of indulgence; while dreamy romance and the spirit of adventure may anticipate, amid its sternest duties and most rigid self-denials, opportunities for ministering to morbid propensities, or, in temporary obliviousness, for loosing sight of selfish disappointments.

And, prompted by such considerations, many, no doubt, have entered the sacred office, and, because they *have* realized their expectations by subordinating its holy functions to the most unholy gratifications, or, learning their mistake, and loathing every thing connected with it, have sooner or later been overtaken by the consequences of their wickedness and folly and at the same time disgraced themselves and their calling. It would be easy to furnish an extended list of persons whose history strikingly illustrates this statement. They ran, but they were not sent. They were among God's servants, but they were not of them; while their apostacies only more firmly establish the truth, that God calls none, whom by his renovating power he does not prepare for their vocation. And such will honor and serve the ministry instead of making the ministry honor and serve them.

2. *The graceless minister cannot discern for himself, much less communicate to others the true idea of spiritual things.* He may master the history of Christianity; he may comprehend its doctrines and their logical connections as matters of theory; he may become familiar with Scripture phraseology and apply it to appropriate topics; nay, he may learn and repeat by note something of Christian experience, and speak freely of joys and sorrows, of encouragements and difficulties; but the difference between him and the true child of God, is as was the difference between the Samaritans, hearing the woman from the well speak of the Messiah, and seeing him for themselves. And the teachings of such a one, will compare with the teachings of him who has sat at the Master's feet and leaned upon his breast, as do the descriptions of dangers, hardships, battles, landscapes, architecture, and picture-galleries, as given by a person who has taken his ideas from books and drawings, when compared with the life-like delineations of one, who has gone through those dangers, endured those hardships, fought those battles, and gazed upon those landscapes and works of genius. The unregenerate man may preach repentance; he may explain the meaning of the word and state the several features of the work, with verbal accuracy. He may insist upon its necessity and the consequences of impenitence; but he cannot lead the inquiring soul through all the difficulties, which lie between our perverse nature and a holy God. He knows nothing of them. They were never fully written out, so that he could learn them from books, and he has never encountered them so as to understand by experience. No more can he impart just views of depravity, the deceitfulness of the heart and the danger of living in sin, who has not seen his own heart in the light of a holy law; nor can he unfold the peace and joy of a justifying faith, except he has experienced for himself a blessed deliverance through our Lord Jesus Christ. In selecting a guide into the great temple of truth and grace for those who are besotted by sin and bewildered by error, God has not appointed those who have never been initiated into that temple, but who are themselves as much under the power and dominion of sin as those, they should direct, and have as much need of guidance. As well might we suppose that a judicious father would employ a blind man to give instruction to his children on optics, or as a music teacher, one who is incapable of distinguishing between discordant and harmonious sounds. No such absurdities disfigure the Divine plan.

3. A final reason why the great Shepherd never sends men destitute of piety into his fold is, *that there can be no sympathy between them and the sheep.* Sympathy, to be discriminating and worthy of the name, can only grow out of a common experience. We may pity the unfortunate without having been unfortunate ourselves. We may admire or envy our superiors without having realized a like position or similar qualifications. But we never can appreciate the sufferings of the one or the delights of the other, so as to occasion the truly sympathetic response. If we have labored through the slough of despond, if we have felt the miry clay giving way beneath our feet and clinging to our garments, our natures can yearn over those who are yet sinking there, as well as over those who, though escaped from it, are not washed from its pollutions. It should be remembered, that the Church needs more sympathy than instruction. She has more difficulties in her practice than in her theory, in her feelings than in her faith; while she is much more susceptible to those than to these. Light may fall upon the understanding with all the brilliancy of moon-beams on burnished steel, and leave the heart as hard and cold. It is the province of light alone to make manifest, while love is the power which transforms. If the children of God can have but one in their leaders, let them have the heart that glows with affectionate solicitude, rather than the cold intellect, which glows with bewildering effulgence. Let them have pastors who can carry out the apostolic injunction, to weep with those that weep and rejoice with those who rejoice. Let them realize in their heart of hearts, the answering thrill, that those who watch for their souls know how to *feel* for them as well as how to impart knowledge to them. In the mazes of despondency; beneath the weight of crushing care, in the keen anguish of bereavement, amid the whirl of manifold temptations, let them not be chilled with cold and formal teachings, but let them rather be soothed, consoled, cheered and supported by the gushings of a sympathetic heart. It is to this end that the Saviour generally affords his servants ample and diversified experience, that from this source they may meet the spiritual wants of his people. That there are hirelings in the fold who look with amazement upon the pantings of the flock, is evident, but surely, God never sent them there.

III. Is then success in Preaching the Gospel a necessary or reliable evidence of a Divine Call?

Let care be taken to distinguish between this and another, with which it is liable to be confounded. *Will those, whom God has called, be successful?* Though very similar in form, they are so dissimilar in fact that one should be answered in the affirmative, the other in the negative. That the heaven-commissioned ambassador shall not "labor in vain nor spend his strength for naught," the Scriptures clearly teach. "Follow me," said Jesus, "and I will make you fishers of men." They had the assurance that they should not only fish for, but "catch men." But whether that success was to be a prerequisite proof, that God required them to preach the gospel, is quite a different thing. A Divine of some distinction in another denomination recently maintained that no other could be satisfactory, without this. We take issue with him. Our proposition is that, *as a test*, this is altogether inadmissible; that is to say, the question, whether a man is successful in the ministry has nothing to do with settling the other question, whether he ought to be there. We offer the following as proof.

1. *Many ministers have for a time been apparently successful, who in the end have furnished unmistakable evidence that they were intruders from the first.* We say *apparently* because we can only judge from appearances. We know little about success. There is no subject upon which we are so liable to be deceived. A man may attract a crowd, may get up great excitements and add large numbers to the Church; and these results may be called success. In a great number of such instances, however, a few years have demonstrated that such men have made more apostates than converts, and produced more rush-light excitements than genuine revivals. And what is worse still, not a few of this class have disgraced themselves and created universal distrust of all measures and movements with which they have been connected. And grant, if you please, that sound conversions have been numerous in a given minister's field of labor, who is to determine how many of them have been the fruit of the earnest prayers and unnoticed efforts of one or more private members of the Church!

2. Again: *a man may toil on for many years without any visible results; he may sow an abundance of good seed and water it a long time with his tears, and finally reap a bountiful harvest.* But according to the theory under con-

sideration he ought to have become satisfied in the mean time, that he was out of his place and abandoned it. Besides, in given fields the earnest and judicious labor of a life time may merely prepare the way for results, and hence the work be left, just as they were about to be realized. Another enters into his labors, puts in his sickle and has nothing to do but reap. Shall we regard the one as unsuccessful and consequently uncalled, and the other as having furnished ample proof that he is God's chosen servant? The truth is we know next to nothing, either in reference to the origin or the character of results. And we are to judge no man by them. His actions are the *fruit* by which we may know him, but for the consequences of his actions he is not to be held responsible. *Success is from God.*

3. Finally, in the very nature of things, this *question must be settled before a man makes trial of himself.* He must rest upon his convictions. They must be satisfactory. He must act upon them, in the most solemn and decisive manner. A young man in making choice of the ministry, turns away from other inviting, honorable, lucrative, it may be, and useful spheres of activity. He may meet much opposition, perhaps from his dearest friends. He devotes, possibly a score of the best years of his life to close confinement and hard study, and expends, or incurs an indebtedness of a large sum of money, to say nothing of other items of self-denial with which every student is conversant. Now, must he do all this upon an uncertainty? Must his entire preparatory course be pursued under the dark shadows of doubt? And if in his first attempts at preaching, he sees no good, must he allow doubt to deepen, until distrust, fear, despondency — enough to stamp desolation upon any man's soul and service—cause him to abandon, at once and forever, the work, to which he had wrongly supposed he was called! Such doctrine is as pernicious in its practical influence as it is unphilosophical in theory. In fact, for aught we can see to the contrary, it destroys the idea of a call from God, unless in a very distant sense. The call, according to this view, is to come from experiments, and to be supported by the testimony of the senses. Add to this, that by its doubt-engendering influence it blights the very hope of that success which is its foundation. Let such notions, if cherished, be given up. Let the decision of the great question be the first thing in order. Let it be settled, not hurriedly, but fully and firmly; and let

that decision support the student in his studies and the minister in his ministrations. Let him feel at every step that necessity is laid upon him, that there is a woe resting upon him, if he preaches not the Gospel.

IV. If now we have stated intelligently what is pre-supposed, and upon what we must *not* make dependence, we have reached the point at which we may directly consider in what a *special call* consists, by what agencies it is effected, and how we become cognizant of it. While the characteristics noticed are indispensable; they are not separately, or all combined, sufficient in themselves. What is needed, in addition, is the *internal conviction* that God requires us to preach his word. The same idea is expressed in one of the standards of another denomination by the test question: "Do you trust that you are *inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to* take upon you the office of the ministry?" Now this conviction is produced just as is in any other religious impression, chiefly by the Word, the Spirit and the Providences of God. It is just as directly from God, as is the conviction that we are sinners and need salvation, and may be just as satisfactory as are the evidences of pardon. We need no more be left in doubt respecting the one than the other, as they rest upon the same evidences in kind, and may in both be alike conclusive. It may be further observed.

1. That this coviction *must be clear*. There should be no question as to the character of our motives, no vacillation as to the specific object, no confounding this with other general impressions, or balancing it against them, but a simple clear conviction, that necessity is laid upon us and that we are subject to the "woe if we preach not the Gospel."

2. It should be *lasting*, not merely occasional and momentary. Like all other convictions, it may, of course, be more vivid and impressive at one time than at an other. There may indeed be intervals, during which doubts preponderate, but the effect of all these agitations will be to sink it still deeper in the mind. A mere flash of excitement will subside when the cause ceases to exist. But a conviction, to become a controlling principle of action, must be permanent. It should rise with us as we rise in spiritual elevation; it should settle upon us even in religious declension, nor abandon us in the most dreadful back-slidings; if we should thus wander from God.

3. It must be *Deep*, taking hold upon the very foundations of our experience and the principles of life itself. It must be so deeply rooted that no cavil can overcome it, no sophistry undermine it, no discouragements wear it away. Amid the clamor of carnal propensities, the voice of conscience should ring out with clarion clearness, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." If lucrative motives bear heavily upon us and other spheres excite our selfish nature, avarice, the love of ease, of fame, that voice should be heard in trumpet tones, "Necessity is laid upon me." "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." If social attachments hold us firmly and tender affection for family and friends would lure us to linger within the charmed circle of home, with the fair prospect and promise of combining religious usefulness with social gratification, nay, if the tears of relative entreaty, the sighs of parental disappointment, the soft persuasions of wedded love, all unite in one overwhelming appeal against our sense of duty, whatever agitation our emotional nature may experience to that sense of duty, we must bow with unreserved submission. Even if adverse providences frown upon us, and rise like mountain barriers before us, we must not waver, we must not be overawed. Delay may be inevitable, but retreat should be regarded as impossible. This solemn conviction must sustain and control us. We must be led by it as by the pillar of cloud and fire. With this aspect of the subject the mind must be made familiar, until the rebellious will is effectually subdued and every antagonistic element is brought into sweet acquiescence with the Divine mandate; then the stern "necessity" will be changed into a glorious privilege and that appalling "woe," into a precious promise.

In conclusion we see that *preaching furnishes no occacasion for glorying.* It is indeed a noble, blessed work, a work which angels might covet, but a work to which man must be moved by "necessity" before he will engage in it. God calls him to it, God fits him for it, God sustains him in it, and God gives the success which attends him. Unbecoming as it is for any one in any sphere to boast of his wisdom or his efficiency, poor dependent creatures as we all are, yet least of all does it become the servant of Christ to boast, whose highest glory it should be that Divine power is made manifest through his weakness, and who honors his calling most when so humbled under a sense of its magnitude as to exclaim with the apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

We see, too, the *occasion* and something of the *character of that "woe" which is pronounced against those who have been called to preach* but who are "disobedient to the heavenly calling." Doubtless such instances occur. An obstinate unwillingness to abandon other pursuits, or some sophistical process of torturing the moral sense, may for a time silence the conscience. But our heavenly Father has wisely so ordered it, that smothered convictions are sure at length to break forth with ten-fold force and clearness, and the voice, which utters the will of God within us, though still and small, when stifled, will speak in thunder peals. We may trifle with conscience but we cannot destroy it. We may rebel against the Divine appointments, but we cannot change them. Hence, those who will not heed the "necessity" which is upon them, while they cannot shake it off, may after a time find a terrible array of *necessities* against them. Self-will may be conquered by the consequences of disobedience, when they may find no room for repentance, though they seek it earnestly with tears. It may now be too late in life. The period for qualifying themselves is past. The mind is rigid and habit is fixed. The obligations of the husband and the father are upon them, and while their convictions are increasingly vivid and inflexible, opposing obstacles multiply and become insurmountable.

Some are too obstinate to bend or even acknowledge their wrong, yet drag out a miserable existence amid reverses and disasters. Their business plans are frustrated; their schemes of ambition are disappointed, their families are distracted by sickness and death, desolation stares them in the face, until life itself becomes a burden. And what they suffer during all this time from remorse of conscience, no pen can describe. Utter recklessness is before them and they run into it rapidly.

Others seek to sustain their religious hope and reputation. They are active in the Church and seek to be useful in different spheres; but find mercy they never can so long as their wills are unsubdued. Their blemished sacrifices will be spurned. God will enter into no compromises with them. And unless they give up their controversy they are sure to become "filled with their own way." Such frequently seek rest in infidelity. Many of the most barefaced sceptics and boldest scoffers have reached their pre-eminence in error and wickedness in this way. And now perhaps as a quieting pro-

cess, they ridicule the convictions they could not resist and the duties they would not perform.

Here is an explanation of the ruin, into which so many promising young men, once the brightest ornaments of the Church, are involved. They know what God requires of them, but they will not submit to his will. They are too proud to accept a calling which almost necessarily excludes them from wealth, political preference and other means of human glory. There are but few steps between obstinacy and abandonment.

We see, also, that *no one called to this work is at liberty to retire from it, unless the considerations involved are effectually removed.* If the call is from God, he only has the right to suspend or countermand it. If he is pleased to do this, of course, the facts and circumstances, which combine to make up that call, will cease to exist. A broken constitution or impaired faculties may be taken as evidences that the Master means to excuse us. But to give up the ministry in consequence of worldly competency, because we have become tired of its hardships and privations, or because some more flattering sphere opens before us, is not simple disobedience; it is *treachery.* And it would be well for such to remember that their convenience will not remove the "necessity," while they should regard as applicable to themselves the language of sacred authority, "Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel."

Let us who have consecrated ourselves to this work, never seek the cool shades of retirement so long as we are fit for active service. We may lessen our labors with a conscientious and discriminating regard to the decline of our energies and powers of endurance; but let it be our prayerful aim to be found in our place, when the summons shall come, and to fall with our harness on.

## ARTICLE VII.

### EXPOSITION OF ROMANS VIII: 33–39.

33. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. 34. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. 35. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? 36. As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. 37. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us. 38. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, 39. Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

THIS is a part of the animated, almost poetical conclusion of the doctrinal portion of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. It is in reference to the whole, beginning at the 31st verse, that the commentators quote Erasmus as saying: *Quid unquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius.*

In the 34th verse, the question of the Apostle implies that no charge can be preferred against God's elect and sustained. Who are they that occupy so safe a position? They belong to God. They are his elect, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. Are they favorites, selected by God from amongst men without referenee to anything in them as determining the choice, selected for the purpose of being conformed to God's image? Election depends on foreknowledge. It is foreseen faith (*fides prævisa*) which is the ground of it. Whom he foreknew, he did predestinate, call, justify, and such he will glorify. Foreknowledge has reference to development under Gospel manifestations.

Faith in Christ, by which we are justified and are made the elect of God exempts from indictment. The law cannot bring a charge. Man cannot or if he should, he will fail in the prosecution. The guarantee of this is God's justification. It is God that justifieth. In the court of heaven, acquittal and acceptance of the elect have taken place. They have been pardoned and are pronounced righteous.

34. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand

of God, who also maketh intercession for us. From whatever source condemnation may come, it is void, it cannot avail. Satan may utter his sentence, man may concur, but all must fall harmless at the feet of God's chosen ones. On the surest grounds is this triumphantly asserted. What are they? Christ has died. He suffered for sinners, made an atonement for sin; his blood which cleanses from all sin has been applied to them; they have been washed in it, and made pure. Their security is in this precious remedy which they have received. A Saviour thus powerful to save, whose highest claims are supported by his triumph over death, and who, although he has disappeared from Earth, lives at God's right hand to make intercession for his disciples, may well be relied on to shield from reproach and deliver from condemnation those whose trust is in him.

Free from apprehension, may the disciple of Christ be. Christ's death releases him from all condemnatory power; what is still more, his resurrection strengthens the conviction that all is well and his continual engagement on his behalf, elevated as he is to Supreme power, completes the confidence, that no enemy can triumph over him. It may be observed here in connection with the intercession of Christ from which so much comfort is derived, that whilst the mode of its performance is differently viewed, it is in its essential features the same, a fountain of unspeakable comfort to the true believer. It is thus represented by Besser, a Lutheran divine, in the 7th volume of his Bibel Stunden. Who intercedeth for us, a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck (Ps. 110 : 4). Set forth as a propitiatory or mercy seat in his blood and having become a permanent offering for our sin, he pledges the salvation of his disciples, by his uninterrupted intercession, for whom he died, rose, ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of God. The Scriptures exhibit the persevering intercession of Christ for the comfort of the weak against the enmity of the Devil and the world and the power of sin, which still cleaves to them, so here and Hebrews 4 : 14–16; 7 : 25 and John 2 : 1. Our entire wants our sympathizing, thoroughly-tried High Priest carries continually on his heart, and whilst the other Comforter, the Holy Ghost is employed in intercession in our hearts (v. 27, 28), the Son of God appears for us before the Father, in as much as he occupies his throne with flesh and blood like ours and exposes to the Father the pierced hands, on which our names are inscrib-

ed. The Spirit intercedes for us with groanings, which cannot be uttered, Christ intercedes for us in the language of royal demand, and on his intercession is founded the support of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ in us."

The mode of representation adopted by Besser is in accordance with Lutheran views. Intercession on the part of the Saviour has been portrayed as consisting simply in sympathy with us and wielding his power on our behalf. Again it has been set forth as impassioned pleading, conformed to human procedure and exhibitions of his humanity, such as belong properly to his humiliation. Intermediate between these is the Lutheran conception. It is not so shadowy as the one or so gross and carnal as the other. It is, however, true, that the mode of representation amongst Lutherans is not uniform. Whilst Feuerborn is quoted by Tholuck as speaking of an *apparitio corporalis* of the Son before his Father as an *oralis intercessio* and only excluding the *gemitus et expansæ manus* as unworthy of Christ, and Luther, as free from such grossness, saying, it is very certain, that he made an offering once for all. But as we are constantly sinning and are weak, he (Christ) labored continually before God, that these sins and infirmities may be forgiven, and strength and the power of the Holy Ghost be imparted, he refers to Philippi, the eminent Lutheran Commentator on the Romans as coinciding with Calvin on the subject of intercession. He quotes in his Commentary on this passage with approbation Calvin as follows: *Porro hanc intercessionem carnali sensu ne metiamur, non enim cogitandus est supplex, flexis genibus, manibus expansis Patrem deprecari: sed quia apparet ipse assidue cum morte et resurrectione sua, quae vice sunt externæ intercessiones, et vivæ orationis efficacium habeat et Patrem nobis concilient, atque exorabilem reddant, merito dicitur intercedere.*

These passages have been pointed interrogatively throughout. Olshausen remarks: I prefer, with Augustine, the interrogative form throughout, the vividness of the language is greatly enhanced by it, Dr. Tholuck remarks in the last edition of his Commentary on Romans: "Two forms of interpunction contend for the superiority. Luth., Calv., Beza, Grot., Rück., Fr., Tisch., translate in the form of questions and answers. Since the time of Augustine, a concatenation of questions has been advocated by Seml., Lachm., deWette. Meyer, dissatisfied with both, returns to the pointing

of Orig., Chrys., Er., and renders, who will prosecute? The answer in the form of a triumphant counter question: God is the justifier, who the condemner (no charge can avail). In regard to Christ, he it is that died etc., who will separate us? This latter, Tholuck considers the least tenable, whilst between the others, he declines making a decision. It may be remarked that the interrogative form gives the passage great animation, whilst it is open to the objection of a series of questions too extended to conform to the usage of the Apostle.

The translation of Olshausen is: Wer wird wider die Erwählten Gottes auftreten, ? Gott, der sie für gerecht erklärt? Wer will sie verdammen? Christus der gestorben, vielmehr der auch auferstanden ist? der auch zur Rechten Gottes ist, der uns auch vertritt?

Philippi adheres to the question and answer form, and gives some strong reasons for not accepting a punctuation, which he regards as attractive. In either way, it may be remarked that the sense is the same. Rhetorical nicety is the main point on which the solution is made to turn.

35. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? The love of Christ may be our love to him or his love to us. The latter is principally designed. The context appears to demand this. The general idea is, no power, however, formidable can arrest the current of a Redeemer's love towards them that love him.

The Christian is not exempt from trials; afflictions are alloted him. He must suffer with his Redeemer and will be glorified with him. His sufferings, however, are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in him. The Apostle is administering consolation to the children of God, who are the children of sorrow. In a preceding passage, he supports the afflicted, by reminding them of the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit; the Spirit, says he, helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. Again, we know all things work together for good to them that love God to them who are called according to his purpose. The adverse powers, which may be conceived to operate against Christians are tribulation etc., may be regarded as various external calamities, see 1 Cor. 6 : 4, and there may be gradation in the words

employed. It is remarked by Philippi that the words translated tribulation and distress differ in this, that the last is a higher grade of the 1st as in 2 Cor. 4 : 8. The last is a tribulation from which there can be no release. Both involve the element of outward pressure, which is, however, not to be separated from internal feelings, the one, the 1st, referring more to the outward, the other to the inward. In reference to the other words, we take the following references from Philippi, persecution, see Acts 1 : 8 ; 13 : 50. Matt. 5 : 10–12 ; 13 : 21. John 15 : 20. Sword comp. Acts 12 : 2. Paul refers to the mode of his own death. Comp. in the passage 1 Cor. 4 : 11–13 ; 15 : 30–32. 2 Cor. 4 : 8–11 ; 11 : 23–27.

36. As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long, we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

Citation from the 44th Psalm strictly in accordance with the Septuagint. The reference is specially, as remarked by Philippi, to the sword in the preceding verse. It will be, as it has been, and the past typifies the future. Under the Old Testament dispensation the lot of God's people was suffering, the New Testament saint realizes the same. You are led to expect some outward opposition and amongst the rest violent death, so the Psalmist portrays others of his time. But none of these things, no conformity to great trials of those who have gone before you should intimidate you. You are safe. Weapons may be framed against you ; they will be, but they cannot prosper. The victory is with those whom Christ loves. It can be with no other.

37. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. Olshausen translates : Aber in diesem allen überwinden wir weit durch den, der uns geliebet hat ?

Nay, the word thus translated, remarks one, in the sense of *imo vero*, introduces the positive refutation. Philippi remarks in the sense of at widerlegt in der Form des Einwandes.

The things referred to are the afflictions mentioned in verses 35 and 36. In all these, powerful as they may be, we are abundantly victorious, Luther wir überwinden weit. On the word Philippi remarks : *plus quam vincimus, egregie vincimus.* See on the cumulative rather superlative force of the word ch. 5 : 20. We are not only equal to these trials

but an overmatch for them (Weit überlegen): *Amplius quam victores sumus, quoniam in cruce etiam gloriamur. Beza.*

Through him that loved us. Who? God or Christ? Both advocated. The better opinion, Christ. He is the subject and the reference is to his death, his death on the cross, his death for us than which there is no act of his love more striking. We are carried back to the 32d verse. He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things.

This *argumentum a majori ad minus* implies that every blessing may be expected from him, who gave his Son, not merely sent him into the world, but gave him up to the death of the cross that the way might be opened for our eternal redemption. The love thus manifested to Christ is referred to in the 37th verse and it is through him that manifested it that "die Siegeskraft geht weiter als die Aufgabe."

38, 39. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

The Apostle expresses his firm conviction, not merely the result of his own reasoning, but of a judgment, enlightened by the special presence of the Spirit of God, that nothing in the universe can deprive the Christian of the love of God, that is, prevail to induce God to give him up or to depart from him. In regard to the specification of inimical influences or destructive agencies, two views have been presented. One is, that nothing in the universe can detach God's love from his children without assigning a special sense to each particular in the list of adverse influences. The other and we think better decision is, that every member of the sentence has its import. Some of the specifications may not readily yield their significance, but that does not militate against them. They may have meaning, though we cannot reach it. Unable to do so, we may be content. Impossibilities are not expected of us and no exposition however complete could give additional weight to the clear announcement of our independence of any and every hostile power.

However strenuously it may have been maintained that the language of the Apostle asserts the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints as held by Calvinists, we find no such perseverance here, nor have we discovered it elsewhere

in the word of God. It is, in our judgment, utterly irreconcilable with the freedom of man and many explicit declarations of the word of God.

God is not fickle, he is not passionate, he is not arbitrary, he does not bestow and withdraw his favors without reference to us. He accepts the believer. He is faithful to his children. Separation may take place, but it must be initiated with us. Whilst the heart cleaves to him, whilst faith retains its lodgment in the soul, no power can produce a divorce. If we forsake him, he will forsake us. If any man draws back, his soul can have no pleasure in him. Properly understood the assurance of the Apostle ministers the richest consolation; misunderstood it may foster a deleterious security.

But to the exegesis, which will follow mainly in the track of the excellent Philippi. He had said before no tribulation can separate us from the love of Christ and the reason is now given because nothing can. I am persuaded, *victa omni dubitatione. Bengel.* Comp. 2 Tim. 1 : 12. Neither death nor life—this is connected with 36. The explanation of Grotius: *Neque mortis metus, neque vitæ spes* is not a minute explanation of the words but gives the sense.

Nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers. The question whether good or bad angels, or both, whether principalities are good or bad has not been without perplexity. Commentators differ. We acquiesce for the present in the judgment of Philippi, who decides, not without an exposition of his reasons, that both angels and principalities are to be understood of good angels. The objection to this, that such beings could not engage in any acts of hostility must be conceded, yet it is to be regarded as hypothesis. On the assumption of such opposition, it would be unavailing. Principalities are a higher order of angels. *Sunt additae istae duae voces,* (principalities, powers) *at si Angelorum nomen humilius sonaret, istis plus quiddan exprimetur.* On the subject of the orders of angels, comp. Eph. 1 : 22; 3 : 10, Col. 1 : 16; 2 : 10, 1 Pet. 3 : 22, likewise 1 Thess. 4 : 16. Paul certainly taught, that there are orders of angels. He does not, however, furnish any details on the subject, anything to justify the extravagant notions which have been broached by others. Augustine well remarks: *Quid inter se distent haec vocabula, dicant, qui possent si tamen possunt probare, quod dicunt, ego me ista ignorare confiteor.* Philippi decides against the authenticity of the words,

nor powers, concurring with Fritzsche, Tholuck and, in some measure, with de Wette and Baumgarten Crusius. Nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth. Neither time, present nor to come, neither space in its various dimensions, time and space embracing the universe, nor any thing else conceivable can accomplish this separation.

From our manuscript lectures on this Epistle, we extract the following explanation of those terms. Death, violent death; life, the pleasures of this world, continuance of that existence, which has so many trials. Angels, principalities, powers, angels, bad angels, principalities, powers, the mighty amongst men. Things present, things to come, present and future evils. Height, depth, not what is in heaven or on the Earth, others neither the hope of heaven, nor the dread of disgrace. Nor any other creature, nothing else.

The expression the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord, from which we cannot be separated, is thus described by Phillipi. The love of Christ v. 35, is the love which moved Christ to die for us, the love of God in Christ is the love, which determined the Father to give his son for us; both are one and the same redeeming love of the Trinity.

Heubner's Commentary on the passage presents the following: The whole world cannot subdue the Christian. Paul does not doubt this. Death and threats of death do not alarm the Christian, promises of life do not entice him, angels, even the most powerful spirits, superhuman power and energies (Paul speaks hypothetically as in Gal. 1: 8, if it were supposed that angels would) cannot rob us of the love of God, Things present, namely, evils, to come, threatened evils. The Christian does not fear the future; Height, Heaven, Depth, Hell or the Earth. Others, the highest prosperity and the deepest misery. Separate, deprive us of the love of God: we will retain his love and support ourselves in it. Faith in Christ guaranteeing to us the love of God will bear the Christian in triumph through the greatest conflicts and temptations. K.

## ARTICLE VIII.

### DISSENSIONS AMONG CHRISTIANS.

THE cultivation of a spirit of love and of confidence among Christians is a duty, frequently and earnestly enjoined in the Word of God. It was one of the prominent topics, on which the Saviour himself discoursed in his final interview with his disciples, before his departure from this world. As Christians we are under the most solemn obligations "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," to exercise forbearance and patience, treating with gentleness and forgiveness the frailties and even the reproaches of others, to "put away from us all bitterness and wrath and clamor and evil speaking with all malice," and to be "kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us." The Scriptural injunction is "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." "Do good unto those, who injure you and pray for them that despitefully use you."

"The unity of the Spirit" among those who profess to be the followers of the Redeemer, is not kept, as it should be, "in the bond of peace." Differences, variance and discord, at the present day, do exist, not only among Christians of different denominations, but even among those who are members of the same Christian household, separating the brethren, rending the body of Christ, counteracting the influence of the Gospel and bringing reproach upon the cause of religion, which it is our duty and professed desire to advance. We may truly exclaim, *Tantœne animis cœlestibus iræ?* No one can be insensible to the evil, so prevalent and so disastrous in its influence. We propose in this discussion to speak of the causes, consequences and remedy.

1. Among the causes of this condition of things in the Church, the most prominent is, perhaps, the love of power or the desire of pre-eminence. This seems to be an inherent principle of human nature, more or less common to most men. In some men it is peculiarly strong, and constitutes the governing motive of all their feelings and actions. The possession of power is the object dearest to their hearts, the idol, at whose shrine they worship. Like Diotrephes, who loved to have the pre-eminence among the brethren, they, "prating

with malicious words," desire to manage matters and control affairs, to take the lead in every thing and accomplish their sinister and selfish purposes. Their manner is invariably dogmatic; their sentiments on all subjects are uttered in an oracular tone; they are overbearing and arbitrary towards those who differ from them; they are envious and jealous of the influence, exercised by others. All must submit to their claims, succumb to their wishes, yield to their authority. This love of power, wherever it exists, is one of the strongest impulses to urge an individual onward in the prosecution of his object, and he, who is under its controlling influence is generally not very scrupulous, as to the means, employed for the accomplishment of his ends. This passion, when it becomes the governing principle in a man's life, is pregnant with the most serious, unhappy results. The Church of Christ in every age has felt its withering, blighting influence. Yet how inconsistent is it with the Spirit, inculcated by the Author of our holy religion, and at variance with the character and temper he exhibited. When this love of power, this desire of pre-eminence once enters the Church and animates those who profess to be influenced by the principles of the Gospel, by those higher motives of Christian life, it is not surprising that there should be differences and discord among the brethren. Even good men are often under the influence of this feeling, to a greater extent than they are willing to acknowledge. Among the first disciples a dispute once arose as to the one, who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven. The lesson, which they were taught by the Master, has an application beyond the immediate occasion which elicited the rebuke. "And Jesus called a little child unto him and set him in the midst of them and said, 'Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.'" Also on another occasion he said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister." If the spirit of humility, the temper here required had a place in the hearts of all the followers of Christ what a salutary change among Christians in this respect would soon be effected.

2. Closely connected with this cause is the want of Christian charity, which has contributed very largely to the introduction of discord and dissensions in the Church. If a man

honestly differs from us in sentiment, he is, in his conscientous convictions, entitled to our respeet and sympathy. We have no right to indulge in denunciations against him, or in the use of harsh language, assailing his character, impugning his motives or misinterpreting his actions. We are to accede to others the same privileges, which we claim for ourselves. No one can lawfully interfere with another in the enjoyment of his rights. There must be no manifestation of unkind feeling, or of the spirit of intolerance, but the constant exercise of mutual love and forbearance. *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.* In necessary things there should be unity, in unnecessary things toleration, in all things charity. This is the principle of liberty among the disciples of Christ. This is carrying into practice the precept, laid down by our blessed Redeemer, of doing unto others as we would that they should do unto us. But how often is the rule violated, the principle changed. We meet continually with those in the world, who would introduce among us the bed of Procrustes and shorten or stretch every individual's opinions to the exact dimensions of their own views. Now if Christians had more of that charity, which is not puffed up and which thinketh no evil, they would soon discover, that all truth and wisdom are not in them. This would make them modest, indulgent and courteous towards those, who differ from them in sentiment. There is an acrimonious spirit, which is disposed to look at every thing through a false medium, jaundiced eyes, and criminates and condemns all, however, honest they may be, who occupy a different position from themselves. Paul declares love to be the fulfilling of the law and places it first among the fruits of the Spirit. It is difficult to see, how any Christian man can misapprehend and evade these precepts. There may be discussion — it is proper that there should be—but let it be conducted in a proper spirit, free from all suspicion and bitterness, without the *nigræ succus loliginis*, with kind and cordial feeling, with meekness and gentleness; let it never mar pleasant, fraternal intercourse or impair mutual confidence. "The unity of the Spirit" should always be maintained "in the bond of peace."

3. Another cause of disunion and discord among brethren, disciples of our common Lord and Master, is the undue importance often given to the mere forms and ceremonies of religion. There are those, who seem to make human Confessions paramount to the law of God, who are more concern-

ed for the smallest constructive heresy in belief than for the grossest immorality in the life. We are not opposed to religious creeds. We believe they are necessary for the maintenance of the purity as well as for the stability of the Church. They are important as summaries of our faith, useful in the way of reference, valuable as historical boundaries. We object to them only as oracular authority, when men place upon them undue reliance and magnify their proper position in the Church. Christians must waive disputes in reference to minor points of difference or doctrines of subordinate importance. Ecclesiastical formularies may be so exalted, as to prove fatal to the interests of genuine religion. There may be the form without the power, the shadow without the substance, the mere skeleton without the animating spirit within to give it the freshness of real life. There may be such a thing as a cold, dead orthodoxy, exhibiting only the frame-work of Chistianity and powerless as to its influence upon the world. When once the spirit of Christianity has departed, when "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith" are disregarded for the sake of attending to the "mint and anise and cummin," then how soon do we lose the temper of Christ, and how easy for divisions to arise, the bond of peace to be severed and the Church of Christ rent asunder! However excellent these human creeds may be, they will not in themselves prove an adequate safe-guard against the corruptions, which often creep into the Church, and the evils, which cling to depraved human nature. We must look to something higher and purer for the security, peace and piety of the Church. "Catechisms and Confessions of Faith," says Dr. Chalmers, "are mere landmarks against heresy. It is putting them out of their place to look on them as magazines of truth." This is the true ground. They must be regarded as human productions. We may receive the doctrines they affirm, may feel their historical value, but we cannot recognize them as adequate expositions of Christianity. It is refreshing to find that such has been the position of some of the most prominent and devoted men of different branches of the Christian Church. "Though I am," remarks Dr. Miller, "a decided Calvinist, yet it would never occur to me to place the peculiarities of the Calvinistic creed among the fundamentals of our common Christianity." "All my Theology," says the good Dr. Alexander, "consists in this, that Jesus Christ came into

the world to save sinners." "Nothing," adds another able and experienced Divine, whose praise is in all the Churches, "is more inexplicable and distressing than these thousand divisions, into which the Church is rent. I see one Gospel, simple and sufficient, and I cannot understand the reason, that leads men who receive it, to adopt so many and such conflicting views. My distress is so great that I am ready to exclaim, 'O, that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears.' Alas for this spirit of sectarianism and this love of domination in the Church of God!" The older men become and the greater their attainments in piety, the more do they see the folly of requiring uniformity of sentiment in matters, that are not fundamental, or magnifying those of minor importance. Whilst they cling with every fibre of the heart to the great truths of the evangelical system, they feel that they are not bound to endorse the views or adopt the words of any merely human teacher. Often when men are occupied too exclusively with elaborate and formal expositions or doctrinal defences, others points may be disregarded, the vital spirit of Christianity may expire in the heart, and coldness, suspicion and alienation spring up. By elevating our Confessions beyond their true value, constituted as the human mind is, differences and divisions will arise among the brethren, and a wound be inflicted upon the interests of religion.

4. But after all, the chief cause of these dissensions, of the animosity and strife, which so often exist among brethren of the same precious faith, is the want of sincere, earnest, high-toned piety, the low standard of spirituality among those, who call themselves Christians. Even when men seem to be zealously contending for the truth, the personal feeling enters more largely into the contest than is supposed by the superficial observer. Often when strongest in their expressions of interest for the truth, the desire of victory or the attainment of some sinister object, is the governing motive, the controlling principle in the discussion. It is astonishing, how much our individual predilections and prejudices have to do with the result, with our decisions on all disputed questions. If our piety were of a higher type, there would be less discord, fewer dissensions among Christians. So pure, so gentle, so lovely is Christianity, that if we were imbued with more of its spirit, and were more habitually under its influence, we would feel less inclined to dispute, or follow the mere *dicta* of some partisan leader. We should, it is true, understand

the reason of our faith, the ground of our views on all questions; like the noble Bereans we should examine whether these things are so, yet we should exhibit the docility of a little child and resemble in our character our Divine Teacher, who was meek and lowly in heart; we should not participate in the work of sowing discord among the brethren, even in our desires and our efforts for the maintenance of the truth. It ought to be much more congenial to our feelings to look at those points, in which we agree, and observe how numerous and similar they are, than to dwell continually upon those, in reference to which there is an honest difference of opinion. The cultivation of a higher tone of piety, of greater devotion to the interests of the Redeemer will tend to unite men more in harmony and love, and bind them more closely together, as with a chain forever, in sentiments of everlasting peace and affection.

Having examined the most prominent causes of these dissensions among Christians, which so often dishonor the Christian Church, let us more particularly consider the dangers, to which they expose us, or the consequences which necessarily ensue.

1. In these conflicts among the professed followers of Christ, mutual confidence is shaken, suspicions and heart-burnings are created, a spirit of censoriousness is aroused, Christian influence impaired and the cause of the Redeemer necessarily suffers. Men, occupying positions of honor and of responsibility in the Church, naturally become entangled in the contest and identified with its policy. They often adopt the shibboleths of party and from the position, which they hold, are placed prominently forward as leaders of partisan views. Important interests are sacrificed, solemn obligations violated, official trust abused, and sad misgivings experienced; the Church loses in inefficiency and fails through misguidance to fulfil the high mission, assigned her in the Providence of God.

2. Another evil, resulting from these dissensions among Christians, is that character is unreasonably attacked, ruthlessly assailed and sometimes permanently destroyed. When the spirit of discord prevails, no one is safe. The more exalted the character, the greater often the calumny. It makes no difference, how pious or useful an individual may be, how devoted to his work or earnest in efforts for the good of those around him, he will not be exempt from the influence of unkind suspicion, malignant surmises, misrepresentation, detrac-

tion and obloquy. No act, however, well intended, will escape the tongue of wanton slander. Nothing can be regarded as inviolable or secure, when the bond of peace has been broken. When parties arise in the Church and vague reports are believed and circulated, as witnesses against us, whose character can be considered sacred and inviolable? Who desires to be arraigned before so unjust a tribunal, to be tried by those, whose sentiments are hostile to him, and under circumstances, so unfavorable to the administration of impartial justice? How much opposed is all this to the Apostolic injunction. "Be kindly affectionate one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another."

3. Truth always suffers in these conflicts and error is strengthened. Discussion, when conducted in the proper spirit, in Christian love, is favorable to the truth. Error is detected, exposed and confuted. But angry disputes and passionate controversy have just the opposite effect. They are unfriendly to calm investigation and cool discussion. When passion takes the field, the judgment is warped and reason retires. Men, under its influence, become blinded to the truth; they forget the great interests involved; they contend not "for the faith, which was once delivered to the saints," the cause of righteousness and truth, but for victory, for party, the promotion of their own selfish and ambitious purposes. It is only when truth, rather than triumph, is our object, that reason will assert her rights and charity exercise her legitimate influence and maintain the proper dominion over the soul. When these differences spring up and a disputatious spirit engendered among the brethren, intrigue and corruptions are likely to creep into the Church, and when Christian love has once taken its departure and men become regardless of the rights and welfare of others, the Church is weakened, her progress retarded, her power crippled, her glory tarnished and the Saviour is wounded in the home of his friends.

4. We mention, as another consequence, the prostitution of the public press. This is admitted by all to be an instrument of great power, a mighty engine for good or for evil. We continually observe its influence in the secular as well as the religious world, in the village and the city, in every circle of society and department of life. No matter in what cause we are laboring, we are anxious to enlist on its behalf the interest of the press, because we know the power it exerts upon the public mind, the common impulse it simultane-

ously imparts to the multitudes, scattered all over the land. This power, too, is growing, and it will continue to mould the mind more and more, giving direction to its sentiments on all the great subjects, which engage public attention. Now when this press is perverted and employed in the Church for partisan or selfish designs, it is the last place in the world in which to seek or find the truth. We glory in a free, untrammeled press. *Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.* But when divisions occur in the Church and the bond of peace is broken, the truth is not fairly presented; we read exaggerated and varnished accounts of what is transpiring, improper and false representations of character, and severe criticisms on the actions of brethren. The influence must be mischievious and the result deleterious to interests, the most sacred.

5. All our great Christian enterprises become affected. The cause of benevolence necessarily sustains an injury, the energies and resources of the Church are expended upon unworthy objects, precious time, which might be devoted to exciting an interest in our benevolent institutions, is lost, and worse than lost in efforts to build up party and to extend our influence with that party. Dissensions do not awaken or foster the benevolent feelings. Discord does not strengthen any cause. Mutual collision of respective interests in the Church, like the sorocco of the desert, spreads ruin and desolation all around its path and reduces to a barren heath the region, where once was joy and gladness. The work of missions, of beneficiary education, of Church extension, our institutions of learning and religion, all our benevolent operations feel the destructive influence. There is scarcely a branch of the Christian Church which has not, at some time in its history, felt these sad consequences.

6. The most painful result is the injury which the cause of religion suffers. The piety of the individual, who is a participant in these dissensions, suffers. The contagion spreads, piety languishes, the Holy Spirit is grieved, God's blessing is withdrawn and a spiritual declension rests upon the Church. Our efforts to do good, to advance the cause of religion, to edify the people of God and to lead souls to the Saviour become unavailing. The Achan in the camp must be removed, ere we can enjoy the presence of the Spirit and experience those rich spiritual blessings, which the Father is always willing to bestow. Then will God revive us again, that his people may rejoice in Him. Such being the consequences of divi-

sions and strife, it becomes every Christian to inquire, how far he may be implicated in destroying the peace of the Church, either as principal or accessory or how he may, by his influence in creating differences among the brethren, have hardened men in sin and arrested the progress of the Redeemer's kingdom on earth.

Having considered the causes and consequences of these dissensions let us briefly look at the remedy, by which this evil may be arrested and the "unity of the Spirit" maintained "in the bond of peace."

1. We must learn to know ourselves better and feel more sensibly our own imperfections and liability to err. Burns, the eminent Scotch poet, seems to have believed that good would result,

> "If Providence the gift would gie us
> To see ourselves, as others see us."

The great difficulty is that, in our differences with one another, we turn, as some one has said, the large end of the glass towards the faults of others and thus see them very distinctly, but the small end towards our own defects, and conclude that others see them look as small, as we ourselves see them. The result is that we have a most exact inventory of the failings of the brethren, whilst we are blind to our own. We must remember, that we are not perfect. We, too, have our failings and defects. *Vitiis nemo sine nascitur.* When differences exist, the blame is not generally all on one side; therefore it is proper, that we should always make allowance for human infirmity and frailty and concede to others what we desire to claim for ourselves. *Peccatis veniam poscentem reddere rursus.* We must acknowledge moral truth, wherever we find it, and discern and approve of what is right and good even in an opponent. Our own caprice must not be the measure of worth and goodness we see in others. We must not forget, that it is possible for us, too, to be intolerant in our views and unreasonable in our wishes, that our own motives may not be as pure, as we imagine, and that after all we may be more interested in our personal triumph than in the success of truth itself. We cannot get men, mentally constituted as they are, to think alike on all subjects. The Emperor Charles V, once took a deep interest in the mechanism of time pieces. He had a large number of clocks and watches ticking together in his apartment during his retirement in the convent; the difficulty he found, in making any two of

them keep the same time, drew from him an exclamation on the folly of attempting to bring men to think alike in matters of religion, when he could not regulate any two of his time pieces, so as to agree with each other. Our brethren, adopting different views from ourselves, have the same inalienable rights of private judgment, which we posses and so highly prize. This right it is the duty and privilege of all persons to exercise and maintain, so far as their circumstances will permit. A want of charity and severity of judgment too often characterize the professed followers of Christ. Those, who habitually dwell upon their own imperfections, will be disposed to place a more favorable construction upon the actions of their brethren and will regard their errors with greater leniency. They will not indulge in reproachful attacks, or angry debate, or do any thing, calculated to alienate from them those, whom they are under obligations to love. Oh that there were in the Church more of the kindness and gentleness and the tenderness of heart, which the good Archbishop Leighton possessed, who, it is said, would not have handled a rose-bud too roughly, and into whose bosom a terrified bird would have flown!

2. This leads us to remark that as the want of mutual forbearance and love is often the cause of these conflicts, so the exercise of mutual forbearance and forgiveness under injuries and provocations, whether real or imaginary, will be remedial in its influence. We may differ from our brother in our religious opinions, but when we are inclined to assail him or to write bitter things against him, let us remember the fable of the sun and the wind, contending for the traveller's cloak. The wind blew with violence, but the more it blustered, the more closely did the traveller draw his cloak around him; the sun, at length, beamed forth with its calm and penetrating rays and gently warmed him into a disposition to take off his cloak himself. There is nothing so subduing and convincing as love, nothing has so much power to disarm and paralyze an adversary. Approach him in this spirit and you are sure to gain his respect and esteem, even if you fail to dislodge his errors and win him to the truth. As passion and prejudice carry him away, he is certain to cling more tenaciously to his errors, and become less susceptible of any good influence. A discourteous, arrogant, overbearing way of dealing with our opponents never did, and never will, make a sincere convert. Its tendency always has been to confirm men in their prejudices and errors, to harden, exasperate

and embitter the heart. More injury has been done to the cause of Christ by such narrow-minded, impracticable bigotry and intolerance, than by all the open infidelity and avowed opposition to the Gospel, since its first introduction into the world. Let there be an exhibition of continued kindness and love, calm and friendly discussion, but no fierce and angry expressions, no virulent invective, no return of evil for evil; let us, when reviled, revile not again but commit our cause "to Him, that judgeth righteously." The fire of enimity soon kindles a similar spirit. "A wrathful man stirreth up strife, but he, that is slow to anger, appeaseth strife."

> "You may ride us with one soft kiss a thousand furlongs, ere
> With spur we beat an acre."

In all ages a meek, forbearing temper has achieved wonderful conquests. The power of kindness is irresistible. Love begets love. How did Jacob conciliate his enraged brethren? Not by showing a bold front and marshalling a host to intimidate or injure him, but by kindness, by doing him good, by an appeal to his better feelings, by manifesting a disposition, susceptible of warm affections, and by assuming the character and employing the language of humility. If Esau could be won in this way, why need we despair? Paul, too, softened the prejudices of his countrymen and disarmed their hostility by evincing, a tender, affectionate spirit. Charity never faileth, and the more of this temper we possess, the more we resemble our Divine Master, who "when he suffered, threatened not" and who, although defamed and ill-treated, went about doing good, maintaining a meek and quiet life, inculcating peace and exemplifying in his life its pure and lovely spirit. It is this divine *agape*, that lives in the hearts of the redeemed, yielding its sweetest fruits and shedding its brightest glory in its own native climes. If this spirit of the Author of our Christianity, who maketh his sun to shine, the rain to descend and the fruitful seasons to change for the evil and good, more generally prevailed, how soon would the breaches in Zion be healed and these unhappy differences cease! Everything like unkindness and dissension, every thing that is at variance with all that is gentle and lovely in Christianity every thing that is causing leanness and blighting would be removed. Men would "love one another with a pure heart fervently;" they would "follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another."

3. If our thoughts were more frequently turned to death, the grave and the final account, which we are to render for all that we have done upon the earth, our dissensions would be viewed in a very different light and our present differences considered of small moment; we would more intelligently and earnestly maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. "Oh, the grave! the grave! it buries every error, covers every defect, extinguishes every resentment. From this peaceful bosom springs none but fond regrets and tender recollections. Who can look down, even upon the grave of an enemy, and not feel a compunctious throb, that ever he should have warred with the poor handful of earth that now lies mouldering before him?" How the voice of detraction and calumny is now silenced — faults changed to foibles, and errors to weaknesses; we are taught to exhibit to others in life no other feelings than those, which we would love to cherish, as we stand by the open grave, and to show to others that love, which suffereth long and is kind, which is not easily provoked, and which thinketh no evil, which beareth all things, endureth all things, believeth all things, and which we never regret that we showed, even to a foe when he dies. Our contentions and collisions must have an end. In a little time our work on earth will also be done, and we shall rest from our labors. How it will plant our dying pillow with thorns to remember our ill-feeling, our unkind expressions, to think of the injury we have done others, the sorrow we have inflicted, to recall to mind, how we calumniated character, destroyed reputation and blasted fond hopes, how we impaired the influence and abridged the usefulness of those, who labored to do good. "He attacked me by name and sought to wound and vex me again and again. And now that death has come between us, and the grave has closed upon him, and Heaven opened its door to take him in, it is to me a source of inexpressible pleasure that I never wrote a line in reply to any thing he said, that I never threw back one of his arrows, never said a word I would not love to repeat to him on his dying bed or in our Father's House. What is it now to him or to me, that he could not approve what I was doing to work out God's will here? In the light of eternity he sees his error, if he was wrong, or mine if I was wrong; and when we meet in glory we will see eye to eye. So I would live with all men. We may and will differ widely and often we are tempted to write bitter things of each other,

but death seals up our work, and then the more we have loved and the less we have quarreled, the higher will be our joy and the deeper our death-bed peace." Life is short, friends are passing away, the work we have to perform is important, we cannot afford to spend precious time in petty contention and disagreement. Heaven is a place of perfect peace and purity. To inherit the promises we must become meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, we must cultivate the spirit of Christ and be at peace with all men.

4. Prayer will be found a successful antidote to the evils of which we complain. In the beautiful language of Jeremy Taylor, "Prayer is the peace of our spirit, the stillness of our thoughts, the evenness of our reccollection, the seat of our meditation, the rest of our cares, and the calm of our tempest. Prayer is the issue of a quiet mind, of untroubled thoughts; it is the daughter of charity, and the sister of meekness." The spirit of prayer, of earnest supplication at the mercy seat has no affinity with the spirit of unkindness, of bitterness and wrath. We cannot go from our closet, where we have been communing with our God, where we have had humbling views of our own unworthiness, where we have heard the groans and seen the agonies and blood of our blessed Redeemer, and hate and injure our brother. Let the love of God and of man animate and warm our hearts in prayer, and our censoriousness and rancor will cease; our very countenance will radiate with love, and our life reflect the image of Christ. If we made it a rule never to engage in any act or utter any sentiments, upon which we cannot ask the blessing of God, dissensions among the brethren in the Church would speedily have an end.

"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." As the dew that fell upon the sacred mountain, reviving the face of nature, and diffusing the freshness of health through the vegetable kingdom, so is the spirit of peace in this world of conflict. It spreads a charm over society, fills men with joy and gladness, and assimilates this earth to Heaven, "Let us seek after peace with all our hearts." "I beseech you," says the Apostle, "that ye walk worthy of your vocation, with all lowliness and meekness with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

## ARTICLE IX.

### HYMN FROM THE GERMAN.

Translated from a modified reading of Klopstock's
"*Du, desz sich alle Himmel freu'n,*"
Being an amplification of the Lord's Prayer.

By Rev. M. Sheeleigh, A. M., Philadelphia.

O Thou, in whom the heav'ns rejoice,
My soul responds with joyful voice,
That Thou, yea Thou, with tender heart, —
O God! that Thou my Father art,
And never wilt from me depart.

Our lispings never can exclaim
How high the glory of Thy name:
That highest name be hallowed here,
Eternal One, in love sincere,
By all upon this earthly sphere.

Thou reignest, Lord; whose reign like Thine?
Thy kingdom doth all worlds combine:
With love no Father's heart has known,
Thou hast, through Christ, Thy kingdom shown,
To bring us even to Thy throne.

Thou, Lord, who dost Thyself reveal,
In Him our blessedness to seal,
On earth be done Thy holy will,
As done high in Thy heavenly hill,—
O that we may the same fulfil!

Be near, our earthly wants to stay;
Give us our bread from day to day:
If Thou dost pleasure send, or pain,
Grant us a joyous, thankful strain,
While ever striving heav'n to gain.

And do Thou all our sins forgive, —
Our sins, which Thee so greatly grieve, —
As we, with hearts from hatred free,
Forgive what we in others see,
And mourn that we've offended Thee.

Let no temptation prove too strong,
Still light us by Thy grace along;
When sin affrights with guilty fear,
Or when Thy smile doth disappear,
To keep us be Thou ever near.

Deliver us, we yet entreat,
From every evil that we meet;
O suffer not our hearts to fail,
Keep us, at last, when death assail,
And grant us rest within the veil.

Thou source of bliss, — alone Divine! —
The glory, pow'r, and reign are Thine:
In heav'n, and on this earthly shore,
Thy wondrous Name let all adore,
For ever and for evermore!

---

# ARTICLE X.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa*, with accounts of the manners and customs of the People, and of the chase of the Gorilla, the Crocodile, Leopard, Elephant, Hippopotamus and other Animals. By Paul B. Du Chaillu, Cor. Member of the American Ethnological Society; of the Geographical and Statistical Society of New York; and of the Boston Society of Natural History. With numerous illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1861. This work has been before the public for some months, and has produced a deep impression in this country as well as in England. After reading it, no one will be surprised at its great popularity, for it is an instructive as well as an entertaining book. The author is a French American, a man of good humor and indomitable courage. He passed eight years in Africa, part of which was devoted to a systematic exploration of the interior. He travelled, during this period, 8000 miles, always on foot, and without any white attendant. He shot, stuffed and brought home upwards of 2000 birds, of which more than 60 are new species, and killed more than 1000 quadrupeds, of which 200 were stuffed and brought home, with 80 skeletons. Not less than 20 of these quadrupeds are species hitherto unknown to science. Some thrilling personal adventures are given, and many interesting narratives concerning the native tribes in the equatorial regions of Africa. The accounts of the Gorilla, with its strong likeness to humanity, are of a most marvellous character. We were interested in finding that the author enjoyed the personal acquaintance of our American Missionaries and appreciated their labors. He gives it as his opinion, however, that the hope of successful Christian effort is

based upon its influence over the children; in training those, who are docile and are able to derive benefit from instruction.

*Life and Adventures in the South Pacific.* By a Roving Printer. N. York: Harper & Brothers, 1861. This volume, in an unadorned narrative, gives the personal experience of two young men, engaged, for five years, in a successful whaling expedition, cruising from water to water, and from island to island in the vast marine expanses, extending southward from Japan and the Sandwich Islands, towards the Antarctic Pole, with all the adventures and narrow escapes, incident to such a voyage. Whilst the volume makes no claim to literary merit, the descriptions are quite graphic, the information useful, and the narrative, clearly and simply presented. We regret however to see the work marred with such expressions "would have compelled us to have given up," expressions which are becoming too common at the present day, even among some of our better writers.

*Carthage and her Remains:* being an account of the Excavations and Researches on the site of the Phœnician metropolis in Africa and other adjacent places. Conducted under the auspices of Her Majesty's Government. By Dr. N. Davis, F. R. G. S. etc. With illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1861. This volume is an important acquisition to our historical and geographical knowledge. The author, although his style is not always the most attractive, or his arrangement the most methodical, is a man of great erudition and research, and has given special attention to the subject. As the result of his labors some interesting discoveries were made. The history of Carthage, unfortunately for her memory, has come down to us, principally through the Romans, her hereditary enemies; the opinions, therefore, frequently expressed concerning her, are to be received with some allowance. Her citizens were, no doubt, as brave as civilized, and perhaps, as moral as those of her great rival. Dr. Davis gives, as the result of his investigations, that Carthage is the Ophir of Scripture. This has, however, long been a disputed question, which we still regard as by no means settled. The work is valuable to the scholar and antiquarian, as well as interesting to the general reader.

*T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri sex recognovit Hugo Munro, M. A. Cæsaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico. Recognovit Geo. Long, M. A. Virgili Opera. Ex Recensione J. Conington, A. M. Euripides. Ex Recensione Frederici A. Paley. Accessit Verborum et Nominum Index.* 3 *Vols. Herodotus. Recensuit Josephus W. Blakesley, S. T. B.* 2 *Vols. Thuycides. Recensuit Joannes Gulielmus Donaldson, S. T. P.* 2 *Vols.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1861. These are additional volumes of Harpers' beautiful Series of Classical text-books, containing the text alone, without note or comment, and thus made conveniently small, and easily handled. The publication cannot be otherwise than successful, and it will receive, as it deserves, the highest praise. The books are, in no way, inferior to the corresponding German works, which have been extensively used in this country, and yet they are so tasteful and cheap. In carefully examining the volumes we are surprised to find them printed with so much accuracy. If we were to suggest any improvement, it would be, that the punctuation be a little more full, as this is so important a help to the student. We look with interest to a continuation of the series, until it shall embrace every valuable work in Roman and Grecian literature.

*The Rebellion Record:* A Diary of American Events with Documents, Narratives, Illustrative Incidents, Poetry, etc. Edited by Frank Moore, Author of Diary of the American Revolution, with an introductory address, on the causes of the struggle and the great issues before the People, by Edward Everett. With a copious index, etc. A Colored Map of the United States, and Portraits on steel of Generals Scott, McClellan, Frémont, Butler. Anderson, Dix, Cameron, Lyon, Sprague, President Lincoln and Jefferson Davis. Vol. I complete in itself, containing about 8000 closely printed pages. G. P. Putnam, Publisher, New York. The publication contains a full, impartial and reliable history of the great struggle for free government with complete and accurate copies of all the secession ordinances, Davis' and Stephens' speeches and proclamations, the proclamations and messages of President Lincoln, State papers of all kinds, military proclamations on both sides, speeches and appeals of Southern Union men, English articles on the war, contraband correspondence, radical Northern speeches, Motley's causes of the war, Russell's Letters, Curiosities of Southern war literature, reports of battles and skirmishes, list of officers of regiments, picturesque narratives, patriotic poetry, anecdotes, statistics, etc. The work, which is creditable to the Editor's judgment as well as to his industry, may be said to be a record of the facts which are now passing into history from day to day, combining the advantages of a weekly chronicle and an annual register. It is a periodical of great value and permanent interest; communicating statements from both sides on all the questions and occurrences of the war, it is an acceptable work, at the present time, while to the future historian it will prove invaluable. We advise all, who desire a continuous and complete record of the events that are now transpiring, to procure this important serial. It is worthy of mention, that during the recent trial of the Savannah pirates, it was used, as a reference book for reliable facts. The work continues to be published in weekly and monthly Nos. The illustrations, which accompany the work are alone worth the subscription price. The publisher proposes also to issue the "Spirit of the Pulpit, with reference to the present crisis," and the "Heroes and Martyrs of the War," both of which will be works of attractive interest and permanent value.

*A Pastor's Appeal:* A series of sermons on important subjects, connected with Christian Doctrine and Experience. By Jacob Helfenstein, D. D. Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead, 1861. Dr. Helfenstein has long been known, as a devoted and faithful Pastor. Wherever he has been settled, his labors have been accompanied with the most favorable results. These discourses were prepared by the author in the ordinary course of ministerial labor without any design or expectation of publication, and are now given to the public only from a sense of duty. They are evangelical, earnest and able. Those who have enjoyed the privilege of sitting under the Doctor's ministry will especially read these appeals with deep interest, and value them as a precious memorial of their Pastor's efforts to do them good.

*Memoir of the Rev. Jacob Janeway, D. D.* By Thomas L. Janeway, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1861. The modern press has been prolific in religious biographies; yet books of this kind have importance and value. They contribute, when properly written, a measure of good that cannot be, otherwise, easily supplied. They furnish profitable instruction, speak to us words of comfort and admonition, and present incentives to renewed effort and greater zeal in our

Master's service. The volume before us is an appropriate memorial of a faithful servant of Christ, whose ministerial life was extended over a period of more than half a century, and who left a broad mark upon the generations through which he lived. Occupying important positions in the Presbyterian Church, as pastor of a large and influential city congregation and, for a season, Professor in one of her Theological Seminaries, identified with some of its most prominent interests and advances of the day, and regarded by all as a sincere, earnest Christian, these reminiscences by a beloved son cannot fail to interest and edify, not only the members of his own Church but all who are interested in the advancement of Christ's kingdom. We were very much interested in the perusal of the volume, with the strong, unbroken attachment and affectionate confidence which subsisted between Dr. Janeway and Dr. Green, associated with him for thirteen years as colleague Pastor. They commenced their joint labors with the explicit understanding, that they would remember each other in their daily prayers, and treat each other's character as if it were his own. The consequences were most happy. Never was there any variance, but always peace and harmony. Free from envy and any unworthy feeling, they labored and loved as brethren during the whole period of their collegiate connexion, and on a certain occasion, we find Dr. J. engaged in continuous prayer, three hours, on behalf of his associate, who seemed near unto death, that God would restore him to health, and to the services of the sanctuary. We were also, in reading his Journal, struck with some of the strong expressions which he employs in connexion with the celebration of the Lord's Supper: e. g. "After renewing my covenant and taking the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ, broken and shed for me.—I received the bread as his body, broken for me, and the wine as his blood, shed for me.—I was enabled to exercise faith in the sacrifice of Christ, so as to have communion with him in his broken body and shed blood, receiving them as broken and shed for me." His allusion to one of the Festivals of our Church, the observance of which has been condemned by some denominations, is interesting: "This evening is that which precedes the night on which the Saviour was born. Wonderful night! wonderful event! What matter for joy and praise! I have been trying to rejoice. But ah, how coldly! Oh, for a heart to rejoice, and give glory and praise to God!"

If we would take exception to any thing in the work, it would be to the publication of some of the extracts from the Diary. Not, that there are any improper sentiments introduced. They are all interesting and valuable, and reveal to us the inner life of the man, but they were evidently never designed for another's eye, and we have always felt that there was a delicacy in publishing after an individual's death that, to which he would, if living, object.

*Memoir of Rev. Henry Lobdell, M. D.*, Late Missionary of the American Board at Mosul, including the early history of the Assyrian Mission. By Rev. W. S. Tyler, D. D., Graves Professor of Greek in Amherst College. American Tract Society. Boston. This work contains the record of a good, useful and beloved man, an able and devoted mis sionary of the cross. Such a life is worthy of being embalmed for the edification and encouragement of others. We commend the volume especially to the attention of the young men in our literary and theological schools, with the confident assurance that they will peruse its pages with interest and profit. We need scarcely add, that Professor Tyler, whose graceful pen adorns every thing which it touches, has performed his part well.

*A Memoir of Daniel Safford.* By his Wife. American Tract Society. Boston. When such a man, so laborious, self-sacrificing and useful, passes away from earth, he cannot die. His influence continues to be felt, and is perpetuated until the end of time. Hon. Daniel Safford rose from comparative obscurity, a humble blacksmith, to a position of prominence and honor in the city of Boston. He was widely known for his high personal character, and the deep interest he took in religious and philanthropic movements. He was a man of enlarged practical Chirstian benevolence, and devoted all his income, after a certain sum had been accumulated for his necessary support, to objects of charity. He filled various public stations with credit, and at the time of his death was a member of the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and other prominent Associations of the country. This portraiture of his life was undertaken at the desire of Drs. Blagden and Adams, prominent Pastors in Boston, satisfied, as they were, that it would not be without benefit to the public. We can only wish that his mantle, with the blessing of Heaven, may rest upon all who read the book.

*Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.* Boston. Published by the Board, Missionary House, 33 Pemberton Square, 1861. The Memorial Volume is one of the most important contributions ever made to missionary literature, and to no one could its preparation have been more appropriately committed than to Dr. Anderson, the Senior Secretary of the Board, so long identified with all its interests. He has with eminent success executed the task. The volume contains an account of the Jubilee meeting, held on the completion of its first half century in the year 1860, Dr. Hopkins' admirable discourse, sketches of the founders of the Board, by Dr. Sprague, a philosophical analysis of the literature of the Board and of its Missions, by Dr. Tracy, together with a history of the origin and operations of the Board and other valuable information, having a bearing upon the subject. The publication will awaken in the hearts of all Christians a fresh interest on behalf of Missions, and we should rejoice to see a copy placed in the hands of all, who are interested in the spread of the Gospel.

*The Schoolmaster and his Son:* A narrative of events which occurred during the Thirty-Years' War. Designed for Christian Families. By Rev. K. H. Caspari. Translated from the third edition of the original German. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication, 1861. This is a most delightful little book, by a distinguished German divine, presenting a graphic narrative of historical events, which occurred during the Thirty-Years' War. It is not a fiction, but a record of facts, a simple recital of what actually transpired during one of the most important periods in human history. It is deeply interesting and instructive, showing the power and blessedness of God's grace, and inculcating Scriptural sentiments and useful lessons, in a most attractive form. The religious tone of the book is excellent, so pure and healthful that its influence must be salutary, in impressing the heart and in quickening the faith of child and parent. This is the kind of literature we need, and we hope a copy of the work will find a place in every Sunday School Library in the land. The translation is well done. It is idiomatic, natural and forcible. We indulge the hope, that the Church will be favored with the translation of many similar works, in which the literature of our Transatlantic Church is so rich.

*A Summary of Biblical Antiquities.* For the use of Schools, Bible-Classes and Families. By John W. Nevin, D. D. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. This is a new edition of a most excellent work, which has been for many years before the public, and was prepared by the distinguished author, as a contribution to the great cause of Sabbath School instruction. It is an admirable manual, furnishing, in a brief compass, just the kind of help required in the study of the Scriptures, the value of which can only be appreciated by those who have been accustomed to refer to the volume.

*Union Notes on the Gospels.* Compiled and prepared with especial reference to the wants of Parents and Sunday School Teachers. Edited by Rev. Robert J. Parvin, Pittsfield, Mass. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. This volume, based on the work by Dr. Ash, contains explanatory comments on the Gospels, gathered from various sources, and arranged in appropriate form, designed more particularly to meet the wants of parents and Sunday School Teachers. The aim of the editor has been to bring, within limited compass, reliable explanations of the text, and to render the work subservient to the intelligent study of the Scriptures.

*Leaves from the Tree of Life.* A verse of Scripture with words of Comment, or Illustration for every Day in the Year. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. We are told in the preface, that it was a custom among the Moravians for the elders (brethren and sisters), to visit daily, in the morning, every house in the settlement, saluting the inhabitants with a passage of Scripture, called "The Daily Word"— a word of warning, or of promise, of comfort, or of hope. In course of time, it became their custom to print this daily word, in advance for the year. Hence was derived the idea of our books of daily texts. In this volume, also, there is a brief, appropriate comment from wise and good men, together with a stanza from some devotional hymn.

*A Compendium of Classical Literature.* Comprising choice extracts, translated from the best Greek and Roman writers, with biographical sketches, accounts of their works, and notes directing to the best editions and translations. Part I. From Homer to Longinus. Part II. From Plautus to Boethius. By Charles Dexter Cleveland, LL. D. Formerly Professor of the Latin and Greek languages in Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., and of the Latin Language and Lierature in the New York University. Philadelphia: E. C. & J. Biddle, 1861. Dr. Cleveland has completed in the present volume his series of specimens from English, American and Classical literature. The works are printed and bound in uniform and appropriate style. They will be found useful, not only as standards in themselves but as means of comparing ancient and modern thought. The biographical sketches, here given, are well written and the extracts are from the best translations. A book of this kind prepared by so ripe a scholar and so experienced a teacher as Professor Cleveland, must be a valuable acquisition to our literature.

*A Dictionary of the English Language.* By Joseph E. Worcester, LL. D. Boston: Hickling, Swan & Brewer, 1860. For several years we have used Worcester in preference to any other Dictionary of the English Language. It is certainly a production of great erudition and of rare merit, the most complete and satisfactory, ever published in this department of literature. The work is an honor to the author, the publisher and the country. The orthography and orthoepy of the language

have received special attention and care, that standard in each being adopted, which is in accordance with the best usage, both in England and America. A vast amount of labor seems to have been bestowed upon the preparation of the work and every effort made to render it correct and useful. Dr. Worcester deserves and will receive the thanks of every scholar and student of the English Language.

*The Pulpit and Rostrum*, containing reports of the best Sermons, Lectures, Orations, etc. New York: E. D. Barker. This serial has reached its twenty-third issue, and is intended to preserve, in convenient form, the best thoughts of our most gifted men, just as they were uttered in all their freshness. All that has appeared so far, is worthy of permanent preservation, and useful for reference. Among the contributors we find the names of Edward Everett, Charles Sumner, Bancroft, Motley, Drs. Beecher, Scudder, Thompson, Bellows, Adams, and others, well known to fame. We are very much pleased with the design, and regard the enterprise as deserving of the encouragement and the support of literary men.

*The Christian Patriot.* A discourse, addressed to the graduating Class of Pennsylvania College, Sept. 15th, 1861. By H. L. Baugher, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College. Gettysburg: H. C. Neinstedt.

*Some of the Mistakes of Educated Men:* The Biennial Adress before the Phrenakosmian Society of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa. By John S. Hart, LL. D. Delivered Sept. 18th, 1861. Philadelphia: G. Sherman & Son.

*Our Country in the Light of History:* An address before the Alumni Association of Pennsylvania College, delivered in Christ's Church, Gettysburg, Pa., Sept. 18th, 1861. By Rev. D. Garver, of Canton, O. Gettysburg: H. C. Neinstedt.

*A Rebellious Nation Reproved:* A Sermon, preached on the Day of Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer, Sept. 26th, 1861. By Rev. B. Sadtler, Pastor of St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Easton, Pa. Davis & Eichman.

*A Sermon*, preached before the Presbyterian Churches of Cleveland, on the National Fast-Day, Sept. 26th, 1861. By Rev. J. B. Bittinger, Pastor of the Euclid Presbyterian Church. Cleveland: E. Cowles & Co.

*Joy in Tribulation.* A Sermon preached on Thanksgiving Day. By Rev. F. W. Brauns. Baltimore: John D. Toy, 1861.

*Ten Reasons why I should regularly attend the Public Worship of God.* By Rev. William Hull. Brooklyn, N. Y.

*Sunday School Class-Book.* For the use of the Sunday School Teacher. By H. H. Rdœel, M. D. Lebanon, Pa.

*The Lutheran Almanac, for* 1862. Baltimore: Published by T. N. Kurtz.

*Der Lutherishe Kalender für das Jahr* 1862. Pastor S. K. Brobst. Allentown, Pa.

*Obrigkeit und Christenthum.* Eine zeitgemäsze Predigt, von Pastor Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Uebersetzt von Pastor F. C. H. Lampe. Philadelphia: Schäfer & Koradi.

*Schul-Gebete* für jeden Tag in der Woche, so wie auch eine Sammlung von schönen Kindergebeten zum Auswendiglernen, von Pastor S. K. Brobst. Allentown, Pa., 1861.

## CONTENTS OF NO. LII.


Article. Page

I. Ministers of the Gospel in time of War, 457
By Rev. G. A. Wenzel, A. M., Philadelphia.

II. John Godfrey Herder, . . . 472
By Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, A. M., Erie, Pa.

III. The Imperishableness of Christianity. 515
By Samuel Sprecher, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, O.

IV. The Races of Men in French History, 543
By Henry Coppee, A. M., Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

V. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers, . . . . . 362

VI. Luther's Works, . . . . . 581
By Rev. E. J. Koons, A. M., Montgomery Co., Pa.

VII. Notices of New Publications, . . . 595

Memorial of the Ev. Luth. Holy Trinity Church, Lancaster, Pa.
The Puritans,
Historical Lectures,
A Text-Book of the History and Doctrines,
Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia,
History of the Church of Christ,
Lessons in Life,
Practical Christianity,

Autobiography of William Neill, D. D.
Dexter's Discourses,
Street Thoughts,
Poems with Autobiographic and other Notes,
Mistakes of Educated Men,
Rebellion Record,
Harper's Magazine,
The Atlantic Monthly.

## ERRATA.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Page 35, | line 27, | from top | for | *Augustine* read | *Augustan.* |
| " 40, | " 30, | " | " | for *Graffito* read | *Graffiti.* |
| " 48, | " 11, | " | " | for *and* read | *awed.* |
| " 182, | " 18, | " | " | for *by* read | *in.* |
| " 197, | " 3, | " | " | for *immediately* read | *immeasurably.* |
| " 443, | " 25, | " | " | for *sorocco* read | *sirocco.* |

# THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. LII.

APRIL, 1862.

## ARTICLE I.

### THE BEARING OF MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL IN TIME OF WAR.—A VOICE FROM LUTHER TO HIS COTEMPORARIES.—A FREE TRANSLATION FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. C. A. HARLESS.

By Rev. G. A. Wenzel, A. M., Philadelphia.

The question has been put to me: what line of conduct should a minister of the Gospel pursue at the present time, and what ought he to do, in order to impart proper advice to his people and, if need be, to his brethren in the ministry, in view of the war, which has broken out among us? Now, it appears to me, that the ministers of our Church need not cast about for a new answer to this question; for we are already abundantly supplied with what in times, such as these, will afford us instruction, and enable us to pursue a course of conduct in accordance with the word of God. Those familiar with Luther's works will there find a sufficiency on this subject, and it is almost needless to refer them to his Tract on "Civil Government,"* or to his Inquiry, "Whether warriors may be in a saving state."† We would only remark in connection, that where, by every species of treachery and fraud, wars are inaugurated in the names of liberty and civilization,

*Published 1523. †Ibid 1527.

it would be well also to examine his Tract "On the war against the Turks."* It contains not a little suited to our times.

In these writings, then, I should think abundant material might be found to furnish an answer to the above question. Since, however, it is not to be presumed, that every one possesses a knowledge of what is not immediately connected with his calling; and since, also, our cotemporaries seem to demand an expression of opinion, based upon personal conviction of the truth and upon a thorough acquaintance with passing events, it may not be superfluous to send forth, in the name of God, along with old familiar truths, such additional evidence as may serve for counsel and encouragement. Whether the questioner will find in what we shall say an answer to every point intended by his inquiry, we will leave undecided. This article is principally designed for Lutheran ministers, not as a rule for clerical oratory, but to strengthen their hearts and consciences, that they may do at the present crisis what their office requires them to do, and to abstain from what their office does not require them to do.

The apostle Peter declares, 1 Pet. 4: 11, "*If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.*" This injunction, which is addressed to Christians generally, carries with it additional weight when applied to ministers. To do this requires, first, an *humble* mind which asks, *whether* it is God's will that we should speak; secondly an *enlightened* eye to discern the signs, by which God reveals his will; and lastly, a *firm* conviction, that God will impart to us, with the knowledge of his will, also the ability to speak what we do speak, as the oracles of God. We will not open our lips, *except we have a certain knowledge that He wills it.* But this knowledge is derived from a two-fold source. In all ordinary cases we are guided by the word of God and the established regulations of our office. But there are also times, in which God speaks to us by special Providence in the history of the world, of things the discussion of which does not form a part of the ordinary duties of our calling. Those not accustomed to distinguish the voice of God, addressed to us in the signs and passing events of the times, call these *questions of the age.* But our calling requires us to discern the signs of the times and to hear what God would teach us by them. This, then, is the *first* question namely,

*Published 1528.

*What does God say to us in the signs of the times*, to us as a people? For the existence, honor, laws and customs of our country are threatened. If this be so, then it becomes us to inquire further, what line of conduct should we, filling the office of the Christian ministry, pursue in reference to this fact? Having once settled this point, it will readily follow, how we ought to act in all special and individual cases, pertaining to our office, so as not to transcend certain limits, but, observing moderation in all things, divide the word of God aright and continue in the observance of those rules, which have been appointed for each, with special reference to his gifts and the nature of his calling.

*To arms!* This is the watch-word now sounded throughout the length and breadth of our country. Is this the voice of God? The voice of God to us in a sense, that we can obey the call with a clear conscience? The voice of God so distinctly and unmistakably, that ministers, of whatever confession, can say yea and amen to it? As for myself, I do not entertain the shadow of a doubt. There would, indeed, be room for doubt only in case the sword was to be drawn against God's truth and justice on earth; in case war was to be proclaimed for the sake of robbery, oppression and the destruction of peace, instead of preserving peace and of preventing robbery and oppression; or in case the call to arms had proceeded not from those whom God has placed in authority over our people, that they might serve Him with the power of the sword, who has intrusted it to them as a defence against evil-doers and all who trample on justice and thirst for robbery and oppression. But such is not the case here. We are threatened by a hostile power; but right is on our side. It is for the maintenance and protection of this right, that our government which, according to the will of God, does not bear the sword in vain, has called our nation to arms. A doubt, as to whether it ought to obey this call, can only be entertained among those, who regard war in general as opposed to the will and government of God.

But here is precisely the point, where the ministers are required, by virtue of their office, to enlighten the consciences and embolden the hearts of their people. It is a mistaken principle for a minister to attempt to separate the temporal and spiritual, and refuse to have anything to do with war and rumors of war, on the ground, that he is a minister of peace. For that peace which the minister has to proclaim is not a simple, worldly peace, which ceases when war begins; and

the minister who imagines God's will and government to be at an end, where the boundary line of temporal affairs begins, is far from possessing a correct knowledge of these temporal affairs. Both the kingdom of Christ and that of this world are subject to the government of God, the only difference between them consisting in their form, the means they employ, and the ends they seek to accomplish. And whilst the temporal sword possesses no authority in the kingdom of Christ and the communion of living Christians, it enjoys full Divine authority in the kingdoms of this world against the assaults of the wicked. For "God has ordained two governments; namely, the spiritual which, through the operations of the Holy Spirit, under Christ, makes Christians and pious people; and the temporal, which restrains the wicked and infidels, that they must preserve outward peace, whether they are willing or not. It is there, that Paul explained the temporal sword in Rom. 13: 3, where he says, it is not a terror to good works, but to the evil. And Peter says in his first epistle 2: 14, It is sent for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do well. Now if any one should attempt to govern the world exclusively by the precepts of the gospel and abolish all civil law and the sword, under the pretext, that all had been baptized and were Christians, who, according to the gospel, are not to be controlled by civil law and the sword, and that such control would not be necessary, what do you think such a man would do? He would unchain and let loose all the ferocious and wild beasts, to bite and tear every body in pieces, and, at the same time, pretend they were all nice, tame and harmless little animals. I, however, would feel by my wounds that it was not so. Where such a state of things was permitted to exist, the wicked would, under the Christian name, abuse evangelical liberty, exact their villanies and say, 'we are Christians and not subject to the civil law and the sword,' as some already boisterously and foolishly maintain. To such we would have to reply: it is, indeed, true, that Christians are not subject to the civil law and the sword on their own account, nor do they need it; but see to it, and first people the world with *real* Christians, before you attempt to govern them in a Christian and evangelical manner. This you will, however, never be able to do. For the world and the great multitude are and will remain unbelievers, notwithstanding they are all baptized and bear the Christian name. Moreover Christians live, (as we say) far apart; hence it is not

practicable, in this world, to introduce a Christian government universally over the whole earth, yea, not even over a single country, or any considerable number of men; for the wicked are ever more numerous than the pious. The attempt therefore, to rule an entire country or the world, with the gospel, would be, as if a shepherd was to turn loose into one stall, wolves, lions, eagles and sheep and say to them, 'now feed together and be good and peaceable among yourselves, the stall is open, you have plenty of food, and of dogs and clubs you need not be afraid. Now, the sheep would doubtless keep the peace and quietly permit themselves to be fed and governed; but they would not live long, nor would one animal be safe from the other. Therefore must these two governments be carefully distinguished, the one from the other; one which makes men pious, and the other which secures external peace and prevents crime. In this world the one is not complete without the other."*

But that which establishes the justice and authority of the sword within one and the same nation or State, establishes it also among different nations and States in their relations to each other. The sword has not been given as an instrument wherewith to commit injustice and oppression, but as a defence against them. This is its design. Now the Christian must know, that where it is used for this purpose (and especially by those who wield it by virtue of their office,) the service, rendered with the sword, is a true service of God. In this Christians should not permit themselves to be confounded, especially by those Manchester and cotton politicians, who ostensibly carry about the Christian olive branch of peace. For "the authority of the sword is also recognized in the New Testament, by the word and command of God, and those who use it rightfully and fight with it in obedience to law, are serving God with it and are obeying his word. Objectors should remember, that if we admit the use of the sword to be wrong in itself, we are forced to the conclusion, that its employment is wrong in every sense; for if the sword is to be rejected as an instrument of war, it must also be rejected as an instrument in the punishment of evil-doers and the maintenance of peace. In short, its use would be unjust in any and every sense; for the object of rightful war is nothing but to punish evil-doers and maintain peace. In the case of a robber, a murder or an adulter-

*Luther on Civil Government.

er, punishment is inflicted on a single individual only; but in a just war a whole multitude of evil-doers are punished at once, the measure of their crimes being proportioned to their number. Therefore, if the use of the sword is proper in one case, it is proper and good in all, for the sword is not a fox-tail and is called the wrath of God in Rom. 13: 4."*

Hence we must not, during the prevalence of a righteous war, regard its servitude, or permit the idle lamentation, 'all this conflicts with the operations of the kingdom of grace,' to warp our judgment as to its holy and Divine earnestness. "For since the sword is appointed of God to punish evil-doers and protect the good, it is also sufficiently evident, that warring and slaying, and whatever the events and laws of war carry along with them, are also appointed of God. What is war else, than punishment inflicted upon injustice and those who perpetrate it? Why do we engage in war, if not to secure peace and obedience? Though warring and slaying do not seem to be works of love, for which reason the unreflecting do not consider them Christian works, and therefore, think it not seemly, that Christians should engage in them, they yet, in reality, are works of love. War with its accompanying servitude is like a skillful physician amputating a leg, an arm, a hand, or destroying an ear or an eye, to save the whole body from falling a prey. If we look merely at the member removed or destroyed, it appears, as if the physician were a cruel and unmerciful man; but when we look at the body which he had thus saved, he is found, in reality, an excellent and faithful man, and performs, as far as he is concerned, a good Christian work. Thus also it is with regard to war. When we see the wicked punished, the unrighteous destroyed and all kinds of misery produced, it seems to be a very unchristian work and altogether at variance with Christian love; but when we further consider how it protects the good, women and children, houses and homes, property and honor, and how it maintains and preserves peace, then we see how Divine and precious the work really is, and that it destroys only an arm or a leg to save the whole body from perishing. For if the sword did not lay men under restraint and compel them to preserve peace, discord would destroy whatever is in this world. Hence is such a war nothing but a trifling and short discord which prevents one, that would be continual and full of excesses, a small misfortune which

*Luther's Inquiry, whether warriors can be in a saving state.

saves from a greater and more disastrous one. All that is said about war being a great evil is true. But it should also be borne in mind, that the evil which war prevents is still greater. Yea, if all men were pious and inclined to peace, then, indeed, would war be the greatest evil on earth. Or is it of no account, that the world is full of wickedness, that men will not preserve peace, that they commit theft, robbery, murder and dishonor women and children? Such a universal discord, under whose reign no one would be safe, must be prevented by the small discord denominated war or the sword. Therefore does God honor the sword so highly, that He calls it His ordinance, and will not have it said and believed, that it has been invented or appointed by man. For the hand which wields such a sword and destroys with it, is no longer man's hand, but the hand of God; and not man, but God wars and slays. All are his works and judgments. In short, in considering war, we must not simply look at its severities, such as slaying, burning, devastating, etc., like simple-minded children, who see only the physician sawing off a leg or cutting off an arm, but do not perceive the object thereby intended, namely, the preservation of the entire body. We must view war and the office of the sword with the eyes of men and look at the why and wherefore of its fearful violence. Then we shall be convinced that it is a Divine institution and as necessary to mankind as eating and drinking, or any other work."*

Thus discoursed Luther: and as Christianity has, since his time, gained little in wisdom, whilst it has gained much in effeminacy, a discourse of this kind, setting forth the real nature of war, is doubly needed. At a time like the present, it is necessary, that the government, its citizens and soldiery should have their consciences enlightened and their courage confirmed. This is done, when all confidently and firmly believe, that whenever the government, by virtue of its authority, calls its subjects to arms for the purpose of preserving peace and maintaining its supremacy, it acts in obedience to God; and when its soldiery is persuaded, that such authoriiy is not to be exercised in a spirit of wantoness, temerity and a desire for conquest, but that the cause, they have espoused, is the cause of God, and that they are bound in duty to God and their sovereign to maintain it.† For since many of the

*Luther on Civil Government.

†See Luther on Gen. 13 : 4.

military leaders and soldiers of the present day appear to have forgotten where true courage and a good conscience are to be sought, it becomes us to enter our strongest and most solemn protest against the prevailing notion which would teach men to trust in horses and their riders, in military skill and brute force, and testify openly, that these in themselves are nothing, as long as we do not fight valiantly through God, and by Him leap over walls. Let him who goes forth to battle without God have a care, lest He fill his heart with terror and turn the strong man into a woman. Christians alone possess the lion's courage, because they fight through God and with a good conscience, and "he who fights with a well-enlightened conscience fights valiantly, for, most assuredly, where there is a good conscience, there too is undaunted courage and a bold heart; and where courage is undaunted and the heart bold, there, also, will the arm be strong, horse and rider will move briskly, all things be more successful and every circumstance and incident increase the prospect of victory, which God also gives."* Such soldiers, it is true, do not inscribe on their banners the motto, "*Train de plaisir*" but rather this, "Through God we shall do valiantly; for he it it is, that shall tread down our enemies."

That much concerning the duty of the ministry of the gospel in reference to those, in whom is vested the power to call the nation to arms. We will now also consider the *circumstances* under which, more especially, our own nation is summoned to obey this call, and inquire, whether the voice of the Lord declares anything in regard to the subject and if so, what it is. This inquiry will show us, whether ministers of the gospel have already done sufficient, when they have testified to the fact, that the profession of war is also the service of God and that those engaged in it use the sword by Divine right, or whether their duty in reference to this subject carries them beyond these to the people at large.

When Luther addressed the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse, on the subject of war against the Turks, he commenced by saying, that right was on the side of the Emperor and the German nation, whilst the enemy was clearly in the wrong, and what he here says, is, word for word, applicable to the present crisis. He writes, "Since it is certain, that the enemy has no right whatever to begin a war and to invade

*Luther's Inquiry, whether warriors, &c.

those territories which do not belong to him, his warfare is consequently nothing but an act of violence and robbery, by which God chastises the world, just as he sometimes chastises pious men, by means of wicked men. For he is not driven to a war by necessity or to maintain peace within his own territory, as is the case in a well ordered government; but he seeks, like a pirate or highwayman to plunder and injure other lands, which neither have done, nor are doing him injury. He is God's rod and the devil's servant. Of this there is no doubt."* But as Luther speaks here not only of injustice on the part of the enemy, but also of chastisements and God's rod, so he afterwards expatiated more fully upon what must accompany the consciousness of right, where he says, "This quarrel must indeed begin with repentance and we must mend our ways, or we will contend in vain.†

This sort of preaching is greatly needed in these times and forms properly a part of the Christian minister's calling. To summon men to battle does not constitute part of his duty, neither does it become him. But when such a summons has once gone forth from the properly constituted authorities, then does it become his sacred duty to testify, that *national greatness without Christian morality is worm-eaten*, and that *true greatness* does not consist in *self-exaltation and self-glorification*, but in *self-abasement* and *deep humiliation*. It is indeed a pleasing spectacle, and one, too, the sight of which should fill our hearts with gratitude to God, that the uprising of our nation in support of the present war is owing to the fact of its moral sense having been outraged. The people have voluntarily responded by hundreds of thousands to the call of their legitimate government, because they feel, that the question at issue is not so much about men and territory, national honor and military glory, as about the maintenance of the right against aggression, of loyalty to the government against knavery and treachery, and for the preservation of our nationality and the union of our several States against violence. The purer and more genuine their feeling of righteous indignation is preserved, the less will we boast of the greatness of our nation, whilst all our attention and our every energy will be devoted to the solution of the great national problem before us, namely, the preservation of

*Luther's W. W. XX, p. 2644.

†Ibid p. 2646.

right, order, morality and of whatever really contributes to the true prosperity of the nation, and set our hearts in opposition to growing barbarism and revolutionary violence. For it would be sadly out of place to boast of an eminent national glory, whose very existence admits of both a moral and political doubt. Instead of boasting, it becomes us rather to bear in mind, that God exalts the lowly in order to cast down the mighty. And of this we cannot think without a sense of deep humiliation. Woe to us if we forget to humble ourselves before God.

To such an humbling of ourselves, passing events, which must decide our future destiny as a nation, either for good or evil, loudly exhort us. We have long toyed and coquetted with the diabolical principles, which now threaten to destroy us. We have been eating "death in the pot" without knowing it. We have assumed an attitude of defiance against the Almighty. But our sins have found us out.

It must be remembered, that not every nation, in the world's history, that has perished, owes the loss of its independence to the injustice and violence of others, but often to a decree, by which the Lord of the world's history visited the sins of such nations and exposed their unfitness for self-government and independence. If the properties and fortunes of thousands are now destroyed and wasted, partly, in consequence of the well directed blows of a power, which has been nurtured into life and strength for the sake of "filthy lucre," we ought first to ask ourselves, whether all of this could have been possible, if we had not ourselves yielded to the allurements of wealth, or worshipped our "material interests" so exclusively, so blindly, that we entirely overlooked the only foundation on which alone rest securely and permanently, a nation's true power and glory, and without which the mightiest, most wealthy and intelligent nation must perish, yea, become utterly wasted. This foundation is *Christian morality.* When (Southern) daring, wantonness and utter forgetfulness of God and his law, instead of quailing before the overwhelming force which we can oppose to them, speculates in concupiscence and perversity of sentiment, whom have we to thank for it? Does not the blame attach to those in our midst who, for a long time, by their speeches and their writings outraged and disgraced our noble Saxon tongue by making it the advocate of anti-Saxon customs, disorder and ungodliness? And if the sword of our enemies

should sooner or later gain a victory over us, would its history be merely one of suffering, and not one of offences also on our own part? If such should be the final issue of our present struggle, it would not only have to be regarded as a misfortune brought upon us by others, but it would also have to be attributed, in a great measure, to an abandonment by ourselves of the religious principles of our fathers, to that perverseness of sentiment which is ashamed of what once constituted our greatness, which sneers in self-conceited inflation at the simplicity of our ancestors, which squanders the sacred inheritance they have bequeathed to us for the hollow promises held out by visionary schemes and which, in a selfish and contentious spirit and at the instigation of a miserably mean and narrow policy, sets at variance the different States of our once prosperous Union, instead of holding them ~~together in~~ loyalty and self-devotion, so that every member may assist, according to its gifts and position, in working out the destiny of the whole. If God designs to cure us of such disorders, how can He do it otherwise than by scourging us with those very rods, which we have gathered? All this the minister of the gospel must have fully understood, felt and comprehended, before he can raise his voice in support of the nation in perilous times. Do not paint around the head of the nation a mock halo of glory, if you sincerely desire its sanctification and true glory. Tell those, to whom duty requires you to speak, that the hope of victory does not, by any means, rest on our righteousness, but alone on the mercy of God.

But how this is to be done? How may a minister guard his people, both against despondency and false security, without, at the same time, perverting his holy office by turning the pulpit into a political rostrum? On this, something may yet be said. As regards the first point, it seems to me not at all difficult to pursue the proper course. He who in all discourses has laid down this fundamental principle, "By strength of ours can nought be done," etc., cannot go astray. False security, as well as false despondency, depends, first of all, upon the arm of flesh, according as it appears to them, either strong or weak. This mode of calculation must first be overthrown. God's judgments and righteousness are of immeasurable magnitude. They are to be taken into the account, not, however, in figures, but in prayer. The proper prayer begins with the confession, "We are guilty before Thy bar." This does away with false security. To the offering

up of such a prayer you are to exhort the people, instead of discoursing to them about our "glorious country," as if we were the privileged possessors of Divine grace and mercy. Rather tell this national pride boldly to its face, that we are utterly unworthy of God's mercy. But comfort the faint-hearted. Tell them, that we shall not be condemned, if we will condemn ourselves. Support and strengthen them by the salutary assurance drawn from the Divine word, that the chastisements of God are those of a father. If we are to be made whole, it is necessary that He cut deep into our proud flesh. It will prove no injury if the cold iron enters the auriferous vein. His goodness failed to lead us to repentance. He therefore tried other means. Blessed be His holy name!

In short, ministers should divide the word in such a way, that it chastises and comforts always at the same time; only keeping their eyes fixed upon the moral religious conscience of the nation, assailing it with the proper weapons. This is done by always bearing in mind, that the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual. This our spiritual armor we cast aside, when we view the things of this world and its events with the eyes of legislators and warriors and shape our discourses with a view to political effect, or display the passions of politicians, instead of drawing the politic Messrs. *Subtile* and *Conceit* away from themselves, by pointing them to the salutary trial which God has, at this time, sent upon us, that our common danger may unite us, and destroy forever the contradictory and selfish desires of each individual member. For the wisdom and power of the pulpit begins, where the wit and intrigues of diplomacy end. The fact, that all human efforts to keep off the evil day, have failed, is an evidence, that God the Lord has arisen to visit the nation, to chastise us for our national sins and to show our would-be-wise, crafty and inflated politicians, that not they, but He, who sitteth in the circle of the heavens, is at the head of affairs. Such sentiments, whilst they will meet with little or no favor among those who merely take natural reason and political considerations for a guide, will be understood and appreciated by all, whose conscience has been enlightened by Christian morality. To quicken this, and that too by the simplest means, is the duty of the Christian minister. These means he will find when he confines himself to what is more immediately suited to the wants and capacities of his hearers. He should treat rather of the moral than of the political sores

of our national life, give prominence to the bond which unites us as one common brotherhood, rather than to that which unites us as States. He should studiously avoid whatever savors of State or Church politics and simply propose to the consciences of his hearers the question, what we must desire that God, in these perilous times, should do for us all and what we should do for each other? Of this the minister should speak to all, to whom he is, by virtue of his office, required to speak, in a manner not only suited to their mental capacities, but also to their peculiar stations and calling. For since man is governed by the sinful appetite to rule, the minister should be careful, lest he unconciously aids in increasing this desire, by addressing subjects as if they were in authority, or those who govern as if they were only common people. Hence whenever the minister is required to address the common people, he should endeavor to restrain them from carrying even their just demands beyond the proper bounds of law. He should say to them with Luther, "Look you only to the government; as long as this does not lay hold and give the command, keep your own hands, tongues and hearts quiet and concern yourself about nothing. But if you can induce the government to lay hold and give the command, then you may do it. If, however, it is not willing, then must you also not be willing; for if you proceed yourself, then you do wrong and are worse than the other party."* Yes, just at this time, when sedition and rebellion threaten to overturn the country, every minister of the Word of God should do what he consistently can do, to induce the people to take up arms against the enemy, in obedience to the call both of God and our government. This would prove the most effectual cure for the politic Messrs. *Subtile* and *Conceit* and furnish, besides, the best material for a war-speech, such as Luther desired to have addressed to the soldiers on the eve of battle. It runs thus: "Dear comrades, we are here assembled in the service, duty and obedience of our ruler, as we are bound by the will and command of God, to aid our master with our lives and property. Although, in the sight of God, we are, like our enemies, nothing but miserable sinners; yet, since we know, or since we know nothing else, than that in this quarrel our government is in the right, and since we are, on that account certain that such service and obedience is rendered to God himself, therefore, let every one be cool and undaunted

*Admonition against rebellion and insurrection, pub. 1522,

and imagine nothing else, than that his fist is God's fist and his lance God's lance and shout with heart and voice, 'We strike for God and the emperor.' If God gives us the victory, His shall be the glory and the praise. Not ours, but His who gained it through us poor sinners. But the booty and pay we will take, as a gift and present of his Divine goodness and grace to us unworthy ones and heartily thank Him for them. Now may God be with us; forward with joy!"* That courage and cheerfulness may be imparted and preserved to our military officers and men, under the inspiriting influence of such a battle-cry, so that they may look the struggle before them fully and fearlessly in the face,—in this ministers should aid in honest simplicity, not, indeed, as political pulpit orators, but as heralds of the Divine Word and stewards of the Divine government.

Of course, if a minister is called to proclaim the word and truth of God to men in authority, he must not confine himself, in his remarks to them, merely to what usually forms the subject of his discourses to the people and Christians in common, but endeavor through the word of God to quicken also the consciences of those who rule. This he must do without respect of person, so that the office of governing may also be regarded with solemn earnestness. I mean that kind of earnestness, of which Luther speaks in his Tract on War against the Turks. "This earnestness," he says, "would be this, namely, if our kings and princes would sometimes wind, as it were, their affairs into a ball, by collecting all the heads and hearts, hands and feet, at their command into one body, so that they might constitute one mighty host, to whom we might look in the event of a defeat and not permit, as has hitherto been the case, individual kings and princes to march forth, yesterday the King of Hungary, to-day the King of Poland, to-morrow the King of Bohemia, to be eaten up by the Turk, one by one, without anything being gained on our part, whilst our people are betrayed by being led forth to be slaughtered, and so much blood is uselessly shed." Such language it would be well for those to employ whose calling requires them to open their mouths before rulers and men in authority in these days. But this is not every one's calling; and the common people should be encouraged from the pulpit with other words, so that they be not tempted to play rulers and to indulge in censorious criticism against those in

*Luther's Inquiry, whether warriors, &c.

authority. For let it be borne in mind, that governing and declaring war are things, into which not every one should put his tongue, because they require peculiar abilities, the possession of which God has not vouchsafed to all the world, but only to those, to whom he has confided the government, and if these have a sense of their great responsibility and call upon God, He will not forsake them with his power and wisdom.

To sum up: let war-speeches and politics be kept out of the pulpit. But let the voice of that God be heard, whose way is in the sea and whose path in the great waters, and whose foot-steps are not known. Clouds and darkness are round about him in his dealings with men and nations; yet his word guides us through this darkness by its inextinguishable light. Whilst it does not remove the veil that hides the temporal future from our view, it discloses those thoughts which are not our thoughts, the eternal thoughts of peace, which break through all the troubles of time. Such thoughts the minister should endeavor to excite in the hearts of his people, so that they may not continually brood over scenes of temporal misery and woe. The point from which we can raise the world out of its prostrate condition is neither to be found on the earth nor in human thoughts. Our fallen people can only be raised by being taught not to yield to the popular mind, but to follow the mind of God, under the guidance of His word. It cannot be denied, that the people have already begun to perceive, that God is contending with us. But this perception will never assume any distinctness and clearness unless we learn to extract the Divine kernel from the human shell. Therefore, ye ministers, be ye not the interpreters of the popular mind, but rather of the mind and purposes of God concerning the people. Prepare the people to surrender themselves to God unfeignedly and without reserve, no matter to what issue He may bring our temporal affairs. In the bringing about of this preparation political harangues are utterly useless, whilst such preparation itself is everything in political action, for it affords an effectual safeguard, both against rashness on the one hand and despondency on the other. Therefore it behooves you to do all that lies in your power, to induce our vast army to conduct themselves as Christians in the war, for which they have enlisted. This is everything. Let not the certainty that the great majority of them will still remain unchristian, discourage you. One hundred unrighteous men cannot destroy

the good, which ten that are righteous accomplish; and that, through which they accomplish it, is prayer. Teach them, with Luther, to pray, as a Christian soldier ought to pray, and say, "Heavenly Father, I am here in obedience to Thy divine will, engaged in this external work and service of my government, as my duty, first to Thee, and then to my government, for Thy sake, requires of me; and I thank Thy grace and Thy mercy, that Thou hast chosen me for this work, since I feel assured, that it is not sinful, but right and acceptable obedience to Thy holy will. Yet since I know and have been taught by Thy gracious word, that nome of our good works ever justify us, and that none can be saved as warriors, but only as Christians, I will not rely on this my obedience, but do all in obedience to Thy will and in Thy service, heartily believing, that the innocent blood of Thy beloved Son, my Lord Jesus Christ, which He shed in obedience to Thy will, alone redeems and saves me. On this will I take my stand. In this faith will I live and die, fight and do whatever I do, My dear Lord God and Father preserve unto me this faith and ever increase and strengthen it through Thy Spirit, Amen!" If to this you choose to add the Creed and the Lord's Prayer you may do so. Then commit your soul and body into His hand, out with your sword and strike in God's name."

To such a preparation for war may God help our people and all, whose public duty requires them to address them on the subject!

---

## ARTICLE II.

### JOHN GODFREY HERDER.

Translated from Hagenbach's Church History of the XVIIIth and XIXth centuries, viewed from the stand-point of Evangelical Protestantism.

By Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, A. M., Erie, Pa.

*Herder till his appointment in Bückeburg.—Goethe on Herder.—Herder in his official labors in Bückeburg.—The Countess Maria.—Herder's literary labors.—Call to Weimar.—His literary climax.—Journey to Italy.—His death characteristic of Herder.—His great mental powers and vivacity.--Humanity.—Its relation to Christianity and Protestant-*

*ism.—Herder as Theologian.—Human mode of viewing the Divine.—Herder's poetic view of the world.—Sketch of a Journey.—Herder's Christianity.—His theological convictions and theological character.—His views on Theology and the Ministry.—Herder as Preacher.—His talent for religious poetry.—Herder's position in reference to Protestantism.—His conservative tendency.—Strict views of Church discipline and freedom of the Press.—His position in reference to Philosophy.*

JOHN GODFREY HERDER was born at Mohrungen, East Prussia, August 25th 1774. His father, a poor chorister and teacher of a female school, is represented as a man strict and conscientious in performing his duties, very regular and methodical as well as good-natured and taciturn. Herder, however, appears to have inherited more of his mother's than of his father's nature. There was something very tender and sympathetic about his mother which, together with her quickness of comprehension and inclination to ceaseless activity, was transmitted to the son. She was a zealous Christian, and had, as her pastor Trescho testifies, a good knowledge without, however, making a display of it, and was one of the most attentive and most easily affected hearers in the Church. In this household the old spirit of family-worship and pious habits still prevailed. The day, which was spent in industry, was finished by singing a hymn. A deep and lasting impression was made on Herder's mind by these pious, evening hymns. He frequently thought of them with emotion and melancholy longing, and in later years the remembrance of them still impelled him to play on the clavichord and to sing the old chorals in the stillness of the night. A considerable part of the small family-library was composed of books like Arndt's "True Christianity," and it is said the leaf of this book still exists, on which the father wrote the names and birth-days of his children, and a wish for their welfare added to each.

Herder's first education at school was very strict, much was learned though not according to the best and easiest method. A boy like Godfrey Herder would, however, soon have surpassed the other pupils whatever method might have been used. His peculiar talents soon manifested themselves. Even in his early youth his greatest enjoyment consisted in music and poetry. He was fond of ancient history and ancient languages, and his talent for poetry developed in a

wonderful manner. As his poetical taste was, next to the classics, awakened chiefly by the Bible and sacred hymns, it is quite natural that his first attempts at poetry were formed according to these sacred models. His reserve and bashfulness made it difficult for those who directed him in his studies to see clearly what his future career would be; and it happened that Herder, as well as some other eminent theologians (even Luther and Calvin), chose some other pursuit of life before he was led to the study of theology. After he had sighed away a good part of his youth with the pious, but rather melancholy and peevish theologian Trescho, and had consumed many hours of the night in study, he fell into the hands of a regimental surgeon, who took him from his kind parents, whom he never saw again, to Königsberg, in order to teach him the science of surgery. But the fact, that at the first operation witnessed by the tender youth, he swooned, was decisive. Herder was as little fit for a surgeon as a soldier which he had dreaded to become even from his early boyhood. He, therefore, turned to the quiet study of theology and philosophy, of history, of languages and polite literature. But difficulties increased with this change of studies, for the surgeon withdrew his assistance. Königsberg, whose grand architecture had at first astonished him, now became, with all its splendor, a school of severe trial, his poverty connected with modesty and timidity only formed so much the greater contrast to the grand impression he received from external objects. Dependent chiefly on himself now and assisted by only a few noble friends, the genius, pressed and restrained on all sides, was now to break his own way. The struggle, however, soon led to victory, and the path which had at first led through rough and gloomy places soon conducted him cheerfully to the temple of fame.

*Kant* and *Hamann*, men of very different minds, were particularly prominent, in their respective spheres, among the men who at that time adorned the university of Königsberg. Lilienthal, the defender of the good cause of revelation, taught theology. Herder always spoke with the greatest respect of this worthy thelogian, as well as of Kant, though, as we shall see further on, he could not agree with his philosophy. Being appointed teacher in the gymnasium (Frederick's College) of Königsberg, his circumstances gradually improved. Herder was an earnest teacher, who insisted on diligence and attention in his classes, but was just as strict with himself; and with such a course of conduct this

position resulted in inward as well as outward advantages. "I am indebted to teaching," he says, "for the development and clear understanding of many ideas, whoever wishes to acquire these on any subject, let him teach that subject." When his relations had afterwards changed and taken him from the profession of teaching, he often wished that he could teach several years in a university, in order to get rid of his thoughts and ideas and to give them expression in a living manner. This ardent desire to communicate is very important to us in Herder; his was an eclectric nature, easily receiving and easily emitting sparks. Thus the fiery soul of the timid youth gradually matured to the clearness and firmness of manhood. His natural bashfulness decreased, and he "to whom formerly a man with a collar seemed fearful, could now fearlessly, look upon badges of honor and diadems."*

Of his friends in Königsberg, J. G. Hamann was one of the most intimate. "He found in him," Herder's wife says, "what he sought and needed, a sympathizing, affectionate and warm heart for all that is great and good, and a spiritual piety, the strictest moral principles and a genius high and consecrated both in mind and heart. He bore Hamann in his heart and the deepest sympathy united them for time and eternity." Hamann was, as Herder says, "a good handful of years," the older. He exerted a great influence on Herder's life, whilst Herder in return made him known to the literary world as the *Magician of the North.* We expect to speak of Hamann again in another place.

Owing to his removal to the school of Riga in the autumn of 1764, Herder's relation to his friends soon changed. He was twenty years old when he became assistant teacher. Till this time he had worn his own uncurled hair; but now, according to a strict observance of the school custom of the day, a wig was to give the youth an older and a clerical appearance. But more than by the wig, was this done by the character of the man which was able, not only to give him the proper appearance, but also to gain the confidence and affection of the scholars. "His method of teaching," one of his former pupils says, "was so excellent and his intercourse with the pupils was so friendly, that they recited no lessons with greater pleasure than those assigned by him."

*Thus his teacher Trescho, who had visited him in Königsberg, wrote in 1764.

In Riga, Herder found quite a number of old and new friends, and his free, aspiring mind readily adapted itself to the still cherished relics of old Hanseatic customs and institutions. His views were enlarged, and his ideas of political freedom and prosperity, on which he had long been reflecting now received form and distinctness, and became to him truth and reality. His external circumstances also improved from day to day. The bookseller Hartknoch, Herder's student-friend while at Königsberg, published his works which at this time already excited attention, among which the Fragments on German literature and Critical Wälder awakened by their bold spirit many new friends from the literary world on the one hand, and on the other many who envied and opposed him. In order to avoid the unpleasantness which is almost necessarily connected with literary disputes, Herder determined to travel to some foreign country, to which he was also encouraged by his friends. He resigned his position and first went by way of Nantes to Paris at that time the seat of the "encyclopedical" philosophy from which the deistical tendency proceeded and gradually spread over the whole of Germany. He became acquainted with several leaders of this philosophy, and spoke of some of them with great respect, though he did not like their system; for he generally looked for the man, and then knew how to make a distinction between him and his views and opinions. Though his character was thoroughly German, he was still able to appreciate the good qualities of other nations, without overestimating or recommending them for servile and spiritless imitations; and it was from this standpoint that, among other things he judged of French poetry. After having also visited Holland and the Netherlands, he returned to Germany by way of Hamburg, and in this journey made the acquaintance of Lessing, Claudius, Bode, Reimarus and pastor Goetze. Of these, so very different men, Claudius, "the Wandsbecker Messenger," obtained the privileges of that intimate friendship which Hamann already enjoyed, and which, with all the external changes, continually struck deeper roots within.

In accordance with a request which had been made to him in Paris to travel with the prince of Holstein, Oldenburg, Herder proceeded to the court of Eutin where he was well received and preached several times in the Castle-Church. The journey with the prince led him through Darmstadt. Here he formed the acquaintance with the lady who afterwards became his wife, a Miss von Flachsland. "He preach-

ed," his wife relates, "in the Castle-Church. I heard the voice of an angel and words which moved the soul, such as I had never heard. I have no words to express this great unprecedented and unparalleled impression. He stood before me like a heavenly being in a human form. I saw him in the afternoon and expressed my gratitude with a faltering voice; from that time our souls were and are one; our meeting was God's work." He made the acquaintance of Goethe and Jung Stilling in Strassburg, where he spent some time to have an operation performed on his eyes, as he was suffering from fistula lachrymalis. Each of these men gives an account of the impression Herder made on him. Goethe witnessed the resolution and patience, manifested by Herder during the painful and, unfortunately useless, operation. A disagreeable part of Herder's nature appeared very repulsive to Goethe and even at this time occasioned a slight feeling of uneasiness between them. Jung Stilling, on the other hand, gained Herder's entire affection and soon liked him better than he did Goethe. "Never," says Stilling, have I admired any one more than this man." He acknowledges, that he received from him an impulse to *perpetual activity.* "Herder," he says, "has but one thought, and this is a whole world.''

In this confession of Jung Stilling, that he received from Herder "an impulse to perpetual activity," we have given not only the confession of a single individual, but of many, even of whole generations. How many to whom life has appeared in its great importance, are there still who with Stilling received their first impulse to perpetual activity from Herder! And has not the age itself received from him this impulse, this incitation and activity so multifarious, and in extent unlimited? And yet when Stilling made this remark, Herder had scarcely done anything in public life. He was still a youth, full of impelling ideas and plans. "What a motion there must have been in such a mind," says Goethe, "what a fermenting in such a nature, can neither be conceived nor expressed. Great, however, must have been the hidden striving, as will be readily acknowledged, when we consider how many years he afterwards labored and how much he accomplished." This testimony is so much the more reliable, because the disagreeable part of Herder's character appears to have affected Goethe more than the attractive. Goethe continues to say, that Herder had "in his youth something tender in his manner which was very becoming and

agreeable without, however, being very smart. He had a round face, a considerable forehead, a nose a little flat and a pouting mouth which was, however, peculiarly agreeable and lovely. Under black eye-brows a pair of jet black eyes, which never failed to produce an effect, though the one was generally red and inflamed." So far Goethe.

We now approach the manhood of Herder and will follow him in his public official capacity in the Church and school. It is often painful for great minds, who feel that they are adapted to accomplish so much, to be taken suddenly from the free course of genius, developing without all restraint and to be confined to the narrow limits of a circumscribed sphere, and yet this faithfulness to one's calling, and his activity of a great man, in apparently small affairs, is the test of real greatness of mind.

Herder received an honorable call to Bückeberg, the small residence of the count of Schaumburg-Lippe, as counsellor of the consistory and superintendent, which call he willingly accepted, since his relation to the prince of Holstein and his train began to be burdensome. He entered on the duties of his new position in May 1771. The count, a man of a scientific education, of modern enlightenment and not without noble traits, hoped to find in Herder as clever a friend and good companion as he had found in Thomas Abbt, author of a work on "Merit." The count manifested his low views of the ministerial office in expecting that Herder would devote himself chiefly to him and regard the affairs of the Church as secondary. Herder, who had a different notion of the ministerial office than that of a sinecure, was unwilling to do this. He, who afterwards in the Provincial papers attended so strongly against this that "a tutor's or carver's place at the lower end of His Excellence's table" should be regarded as the surest road to clerical offices, did not want to degrade himself to become such a clever table companion and literary carver. This occasioned much discord between him and the count. But the countess became the more intimately attached to her "teacher," as she was accustomed to call him with great respect. This excellent woman, Maria, born countess of Lippe and Sternberg, who seemed to Herder "like an angel from heaven," lost her mother on the day of her birth, and received her first education in the house of her father with her twin brother whom she called her Jonathan. She was afterwards committed to the charge of an elder sister in Silesia, and came under Moravian influence. It was perhaps owing

to this fact that a certain anxious and painful feeling was connected with her deep piety, from which feeling Herder's pure and frank mind gradually relieved her, not by unseasonable enlightenment, but by kindly studying her feelings, by friendly assistance, by progressive instruction and by bringing to bear the advantages of his scientific education and superior intellectual powers.

The correspondence of this countess with Herder is very instructive in a psychological point of view. As the mists which cover a beautiful landscape are scattered by the Sun, so before the penetrating rays of Herder's clearness we see the doubts vanish, which had at first enveloped the tender spirit in gloom, and we behold the image of her soul, the image of a tender feminine nature, becoming more and more friendly, more clear, more confident and more secure. She unfolds herself to her teacher as a flower to the light of the sun, and in doing so gains more inner worth in our eyes. Indeed, I might say that the reformatory calling of Herder, the calling to illuminate without destroying, to pour light into the soul without disquieting and confusing it, but rather making it firmer, manifested itself in this relation to the countess Maria in such a way, as it ought properly to have done, wherever his spirit came. But for this the relations were, of course, not always as favorable as in this case. Many prejudices opposed his activity from without, and much internal uneasiness prevented him from being as free in his actions as he desired, which occasioned him much sorrow. "A pastor, without a congregation! a patron of schools, without schools, counsellor of the consistory, without a consistory!" These were intolerable thoughts for Herder, during the first years he spent in Bückeburg. To Miss von Flachsland he writes: "All my favorite notions of the ministerial office are in part destroyed here, are at least always destroyed when I think of this place and my sphere of activity in it!"

Herder also preached to the congregation, but at first his discourses were too philosophical for the majority of his hearers. Gradually he, however, brought his expressions within the comprehension of all, for which he was universally approved. It thus happened, that even the farmers of the parish listened to him with the greatest attention. And Herder, indeed, spared no exertions to make himself generally understood and to avoid all difficult expressions in his sermons. "My sermons," he writes to Miss von Flachsland, "have as little of the clerical in them as my person; they

are the experience of a full heart, without any forced and confused matter, the use of which I am spared here." Especially the sermons on the Life of Jesus, preached in Bückeburg, made a great impression on his congregation. They are like a field full of the sown grain which awaits the fructifying influences of heaven. His office still gave him sufficient leisure for writing books. The freshest, the most stirring and most ardent effusions of the fancy and the heart came from his pen while in this place. Such for instance are the "Oldest Records of the Human Race" which as it were flowed from a feeling, a gush and a breath, in the morning hours of the longest summer days. "They were unparalleled, blessed, memorable days!" says his wife who shared these intellectual joys with him. Such, too, are the Provincial Letters and the Philosophy of the History of Humanity being the preparation for the later ideas on the same subject.

An attempt (in which the distinguished philologian Heyne was particulary active) to bring Herder to Goettingen as fourth professor of theology and university preacher, failed after various negotiations; for Herder, in order to end these negotiations, which began to be annoying him, immediately answered the question of Goethe, Whether he would accept the appointment of general-superintendent in Weimar, if offered him? in the affirmative. There were at first difficulties in the way of this appointment. Herder's orthodoxy was questioned, his learning was undervalued, and the report was even spread that he could not preach. An estimable member of the town-council of Weimar even requested a trial sermon, with which request Herder, for evident reasons, did not comply.* After many negotiations he entered on the duties of his new office, having first, however, preached the funeral sermon of the deceased countess in Bückeburg, and thus in a very significant manner ending and, as it were, sealing his labors in that place.

By means of his removal to Weimar, Herder was placed in the most intimate relation with the men from whom the new intellectual life of Germany chiefly proceeded with Wieland, Schiller, Goethe, Jean Paul, Knebel and others. Whilst before this Herder had paid considerable attention to literature

*So his biography. The matter, however, appears to be different from the communications in reference to Herder's call to Weimar, viz: that a trial sermon was indeed required according to the old custom of the consistory, but Herder was excused from preaching any, by a rescript of the Duke.

besides his theological labors, he was now in danger of being drawn entirely from theology to literature. His comprehensive mind was, however, able to accomplish much, and the author of the "Cid" and various æsthetic and philosophical works, and the zealous and judicious compiler of national songs of different nations, found sufficient time and strength to fructify theological science with his new and animating ideas, besides the labors connected with his office which he did not neglect and besides his manifold other labors in the Church and school.*

His work on "The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry" and his "Letters on the Study of Theology" (which gave valuable instruction and proper direction to so many young men) exerted a great influence on the views of the age and scattered seed to be developed in the distant future. They were not only a

*It may be seen from Herder's first sermon in Weimar, how earnest and anxious he was in the performances of his ministerial duties. "Methinks," he says, "the spirit of Luther hovers around me and exclaims: 'Look upon that which I have attained by my exertions; see how difficult it was for me and those whose bones rest here (in the Castle-Church) to place the light of the gospel, which was buried in ashes, on the candle stick! Here thou enterest a sphere where everything reminds you what doctrine to teach, whose word you are to proclaim, to what extent and in what an age! You are called to be a shepherd of souls at a time when it is frequently doubted, whether there ought to be such a thing as religion, whether it ought to be regarded and cherished, and when, at least, the stream of thought flows against it and threatens to sweep over it with its furious waves; it is said that it ought not to be thought of, that we can least of all things take care of ourselves by being religious, and that it is the duty of each one to take care of himself, that, therefore, the ministerial office is useless, a remnant of old customs which only continues because of the prejudices in its favor and, to say the least, is so difficult and obsolete that its duties cannot be fully performed in our day. And behold! such an office thou enterest upon here! Their souls shall be required at thy hand! Whatever is born of God through thy instrumentality shall be thine and shall prepare eternal habitations for thee; whatever is neglected by thee and falls away or goes astray shall grieve thy soul forever.' Methinks these words of Luther — or why do I not rather mention the Lord of lords, the King of kings, the Holy One and Protector of all human souls, Jesus Christ, to whom Luther pointed, whose doctrines he preached, why do I not mention Him, as He stands here where more than two or three are gathered, in his name and call on Him, as He stands here in our midst pointing to His word and His congregation saying: 'I have bought and gained them with my blood. Take care of these and all over whom thou hast been placed as shepherd and guardian, that none of those may be lost whom I commit to thee, who are like stars in my hand, are written in my heart and on my breast; for my eyes flame, my blood burns unto the lowest hell.'"

blessing to Germany, but also to Switzerland. As Lavater had at one time made a pilgrimage to Spalding, so in 1780 J. G. Mueller, brother of the historian, travelled on foot from Goettingen to Weimar for no other purpose than that of seeing Herder and asking advice of him about his studies. Herder received him very cordially, and soon the conversation turned on the arrangement of theological studies. A cheerful smile spread over Herder's countenance; he arose and brought from his book-case a volume, which he handed the young man. It was the first part of the "Letters on the study of Theology," which he had received from the publisher but an hour before; and what must have been Herder's joy to find in the very next hour a youth, for whom the book had as it were been written and who, as he himself assures us, received it from Herder's hand with a desire to be instructed and with sincere gratitude. From this hour the friendship between the Weimar and the excellent Schafhauser theologians was formed forever.

We will not now follow Herder in his literary activity in connection with the distinguished men of Weimar. We expect, however, to resume the subject in another place. A journey to Italy, which country Herder had in his early youth longed to visit, reinvigorated his body and recreated his mind. His taste for art and antiquity was exercised and rendered still more acute, and nature, and the customs and manners of the country found in him a keen observer. Whilst in Rome, he received another call to Goettingen; he was very much inclined to accept it; his own Spirit seemed to advise him to go but the reigning duchess, Amelia, succeeded in keeping him in Weimar for life. The latter part of his stay in Weimar* was unfortunately disturbed by much unpleasant experience and also by ill health, and it really makes a sad impression upon us when we hear that on account of this as well as an account of the frustration of earlier plans he exclaimed with grief: "O my disappointed life!" The

*There was no lack of collisions between him and the other great minds which adorned the court of Weimar. It is really humiliating to see what a little, often malicious, spirit of back-biting could enter such a circle, which fact must have embittered his life as much, as he on the other hand, may have been the occasion of annoying others with ill humor. Only compare the malicious representation of Herder's matrimonial life, in the letters of Schiller and Koerner, Vol. I, p. 166. The respect for genius in general decreases, when we see that with all cultivation the rudeness of the natural man, which can only be removed by Christianity, remains in full force.

distinctions conferred on him, the elevation to the vice-presidency and afterwards to the presidency of the consistory (1801) were only a small compensation for what he in vain demanded of himself, and besides involved him in many new difficulties from which he found the best relief in the family circle. The soreness of his eye increased continually. The treatment of the disease both in Aix-la-Chapelle and Egra did not realize his hopes. The three weeks spent in Dresden were the last bright days of his life. He returned to Weimar, Sept. 1803 and on the last day of the month held an examination on angels with an unusual elevation of spirits; he himself was soon to be transported to the invisible world. "It appeared," says John von Mueller, in the letter written to his brother on the death of Herder, "to bear the impress of another world, and to be about beings, to whom he felt himself related." In his last years he longed for nothing more earnestly than for some great high thought on which he might live. Klopstock's "Odes," Young's "Night Thoughts," and Mueller's "Relics" were, next to the Bible, especially the Prophets, the last food of his soul. He died Dec. 18, 1803, after he, whom inner nobility of soul had always elevated above what is low and ordinary, had been externally, also, raised to the nobility a short time previous by the Elector of Bavaria. So much in reference to his external life.

In turning to the characteristics of his inner life, I will quote a few sentences from Jean Paul in reference to Herder: "The noble spirit (of this man) was not appreciated by different times and parties, though not entirely without a reason; for he was so unfortunate as not to be a star of the first or any other magnitude, but an aggregate of stars, from which each man formed a constellation, according to his own pleasure. Men of many various powers are seldom appreciated, those of one particular talent nearly always." This was the case with Herder. Those who only estimate the greatness of a man according to his specific performances in a particular department, who only ask, who was the greatest poet? who the greatest philosopher? who the greatest theologian? will not chime in with the praise of Herder. They will prefer Schiller and Goethe as poets, will place Kant, Fichte and Schelling infinitely higher as philosopers; and as far as theology is concerned, they will ask, whether Herder really accomplished anything extraordinary in the department of exegesis, of Church history, of dogmatics, any thing

which equals what Mosheim, Michaelis, Semler, Ernesti, Döderlein before him, what Griesbach, Eichhorn, Spittler, Plank, at his time, and after him as the most distinguished in their respective spheres, performed? We answer: the greatness in a particular department, however necessary it may be to science in general, and however beneficial to learning, is still not the only greatness worthy of admiration. It is indeed most easily measured, and therefore (as Jean Paul intimates) generally receives its merited admiration, but where life is to be influenced, where new intellectual and moral conditions are to be produced, where new points of view, not within the fixed limits of an art or a science, but within the whole sphere of life are to be disclosed, there it is not so much the men in a particulaar department of learning, who break out a new course, as those universal minds, to which Herder belonged on one side and Goethe on the other. Goethe was certainly still more universal than Herder, but he lacked one thing, which is the most important to us, that deep religiousness, at least the definite relation to Christianity. But in this we find Herder's strength.* Whilst therefore Goethe's influence on the development of a consciousness, of the world, which we do not esteem lightly, was greater than that of Herder, the latter has led the consciousness of God, which is infinitely higher than that of the world back to its lowest depths and has not mingled with that of the world, but has in various ways brought about mediation between the two. Let Herder than be inferior to Schiller and Goethe as a poet, still we have not only the poet in him, but also the theologian, the public popular speaker and the preacher; and this union of the religious-theological genius with the poetical, of the author with the minister of the Church, makes Herder, what he is and assigned him a place which no other mind can fill. Therefore we regard such an appearance as Herder, peculiar in kind, one in which an old period ends and a new one begins; for even if theologians of that time might be mentioned, who surpassed Herder in

*The ingenious comparison between Goethe and Herder may be found in Wm. Humboldt's letters to a female friend, Vol. I, p. 232. Among other things he says (quite in accordance with our views): "Herder was certainly inferior to Schiller and Goethe in compass of mind and poetical talent; but in him there was a blending of soul and fancy, by means of which he accomplished, what both could never have done." Is it not this blending of soul and fancy which constitutes the religious genius?

learning, in extent and profoundity of knowledge, whose investigations in some one department have led to more lasting results than many of the bold views and ideas of Herder's mind, still none of them has exerted so great an influence on life. They have been of more benefit to the school, he of more to the people, especially the more educated part. But Herder has also influenced the school and theology by giving them new life and new tendencies. Or (I ask those who are capable of judging in this matter) of what advantage to the study of the Bible was that lifeless learning of Michaelis which lacked all poetry and therefore all deep truth, when compared with the impulse, which Herder gave to the investigation and interpretation of the Old Testament! In philosophy Kant, Fichte and Schelling, have of course taken the lead, so that their names, like mile-stones mark the stadia in the history of modern philosophy, of which Hegel may be said to form the terminus. But from them the school gained the chief advantage. From them, too, originated that forced, unusual language of the school, which Herder opposed so violently, since he valued the self-dependence of the mind more than the prevalence of coined and imitative forms. And indeed the time has come, when another Herder ought to appear, to purify the temple of science from the trash of the new scholasticism? In the history of archaeology some may have brought to light more profound knowledge, than Herder. But who like Herder has really awakened so many and such great ideas and scattered intellectual sparks, where formerly there had been mostly only dead matter cemented with dead matter, where only numbers and names had been strung together, and only registers and commentaries to registers had been made!

We must not confound Herder's variety of knowledge with a superficial polymathy and a meddling disposition, which know a little of everything, but nothing thoroughly and trip lightly over all the departments of learning. No one was more opposed to a mere smattering of knowledge. Whatever Herder studied, he studied completely and thoroughly and penetrated to the roots and was never satisfied with gathering flowers for the sake of adorning vanity. Everywhere the points of his mind touched the heavens, whilst the weight of the mind sank it to the depths, everywhere his genius appears, and never, never, when it knocks, is the sound hollow; and when he spreads his pinions he never sinks to mediocrity. One may miss in his writings the close deduction, the careful

completion, the mature investigation and connection of thought; one may take offence at his harshness, at apparent contradictions, at groundless, doubtful assertions, especially when he presents them with that confidence which denies the right to all contradiction; but never by the side of the stubborn, will the shallow head appear which says a thing only because others have said it, and only wants to reap where it has not strewn. Nor is his the chaotic variety of the polymathist that has accumulated in him as an undijested mass, which might more probably be regarded as the case with his friend Hamann; we rather see that all that Herder has gathered is immediately changed into sap and blood, is all united harmoniously, and is then again properly distributed and arranged and becomes as it were, Herder. This his cotemporary and opponent also observed, for he remarks in his review of the "Ideas for a History of Humanity," rather blaming than praising. "It seems as if his genius does not only gather the ideas from the wide field of science and art merely for the sake of adding them to others, but as it appears as if he changed them according to certain laws of assimilation peculiar to himself into his specific mode of thought." We should like to understand this expression of Kant in a manner favorable to Herder and to add: The beautiful, the peculiar and admirable in this is, that by means of this process of living personal appropriation nothing essential is lost, but that the idea which passes through his consciousness gains in clearness, in truth, in internal beauty for others, and consequently also in universal validity for all, since he gives back what he has gained, cleansed from all dross. Herder thought and felt *in* his age, *with* his age and *for* his age. He expressed what was on the tongues of many who, however, could not utter it, because they lacked the proper words. The age was mirrored in him. In him humanity found and recognized itself in its humanity. Therefore he was the prophet and representative of *Humanity*. Hence we only understand Herder as poet, as philosopher, as theologian and preacher, when we at the same time understand him as a man. As he gave everything in a living manner, it must be comprehended in the same manner, I might say, must be personally perceived and understood thus. He who wants to receive as it were only goods from him, to gain a definite profit from him, results which he can carry home in his pockets, will not seldom find himself disappointed; he will at first think that the load of wisdom he has found in him is heavy,

but in the end he will find but little in his hands. But whoever seeks in him a living fountain, a strengthening fragrance and inspiring breath, will never come to him in vain. It is not always the bright noonday sun, which beams from Herder's pages; frequently it is a subdued light, a twilight. But we never become gloomy in this twilight, we only cling so much more closely to the guide, who boldly leads the way with the torch in his hand. Though we may often wish, that he were clearer to us, still we never suppose for a moment that he himself does not clearly comprehend the matter. There too, where we miss plan and order, where he leaps rather than walks, we do not fear; and where we least expect it, we are placed on a point, from which an extensive prospect opens to our view.

Let us now, however difficult it may be to keep the particular sides apart, still take up their particular sides of his nature, and in such a manner, that we may never lose sight of the main object we have in view. We intentionally do not begin with that which is connected with this main object, the theological life and activity of the man, but with those talents which supported this life, with his poetic talent, his position in reference to philosophy and the literature of his age; with that, in general, which Herder comprehended in the one word, *humanity* (die Humanität). As far as Herder the poet is concerned, we have already observed, that many might prefer Schiller, Goethe or some other of his cotemporaries (for he must only be compared with these). We will not dispute about such a preference. I readily admit that much, perhaps the most, of the earlier poetry of Herder, has something harsh, unpliant in it which can only be read with reluctance. Herder's poems neither recommend themselves by the sweetness of the rhyme (the most are blank verse), nor by the beauty of the rythm, nor by that peculiar charm, which Schiller's and Goethe's poems possess. But that concerns us less here. The poetical works of Herder, among which his "Cid," his legends and cantata are distinguished as poetical productions, are of less interest to us, than his pure, noble, grand poetical taste. To him, as his wife says, poetry was no empty jingle of words, but the language of God; and Jean Paul appropriately says of him: "Even if he were no poet, he was something better, a poem, an Indo-Grecian-epos, made by some one of the purest gods; for all flowed together in his beautiful soul, as in a poem, and the good, the true, the beautiful was inseparable in it." Herder was as it

were poetized in the Grecian manner according to life. Poetry was not a horizon-appendix to his life, as we often observe a rainbow-colored cluster of clouds on the horizon in foul weather, but it flew like a light rainbow over his clouded life as a gate of heaven." This poetical disposition of Herder, so deeply and heartily prized by Jean Paul, was of infinite value to his theological views. The ability to comprehend religion poetically, to enter into the spirit of the Scriptural-oriental, Old Testament poetry and to interpret the sacred books ingeniously from this spirit, was of great value, furthered the cause of interpretation and suddenly removed many serious difficulties; for in my opinion the reconciliation of theological extremes lies to a great extent in this ingenious poetical view; whence do these extremes mostly originate, if not from an intelligence too dry, freed from all poetry of life, from a prosaic, insipid consequentness? from misunderstanding of the symbolical? Herder at once cut the thread of rabbinical-scholastic subtleties, when he tore the holy things from profane hands and bore them to those regions, into which only a consecrated taste, one susceptible to the beautiful, the peculiar and strange, such as poetry nourishes, can enter. He penetrated to the depths of religious life, as it appears in the history of nations and especially in the people of God, whilst others were wallowing, with a learned air, in the slime, which had accumulated on its surface. To make poetry like Herder's more is necessary than mere versification. Just as he gathered the songs of the most different nations and wove them into one garland, and with the same susceptibility and mobility of spirit inhaled the fragrance of Grecian poetry, with which he imbibed the song of Job and Ossian; so too did he make history, the ground on which his sublime views of life, his philosophy, rested.

Herder was a philosophical poet and a poetical philosopher; but he was neither of these in that superficial generality, in which pretended geniuses love to wander, without foundation, without nourishing roots. Poetry and philosophy were the blossoms of his spirit; the trunk, however, had its roots in history, not indeed in the history of one people or age, but in the history of the human race. The thought first seized by Isaac Iselin, to show "the progress of humanity from the lowest degree of ignorance to continually increasing light and prosperity," was farther developed by Herder in his "Ideas for a philosophy of the history of hu-

manity." Already in the title of the book Herder's mind reflects itself, which does not want philosophy and history to be separated, but to be studied in their most intimate connection and relations to each other. He had as great an aversion to a philosophy which, regardless of history, forms its system from abstract propositions, as to a history, which only accumulates a mass of materials, without letting philosophical ideas shine and waft through them. In this joining of the historical with the philosophical, which forms a higher unity by connecting itself with the poetical view of the world mentioned above, lies the secret of Herder's genius. "*Poetry*, *philosophy* and *history*," he says himself, "are, in my opinion, the three lights which illumine the nations, the sects and the generations; a holy triangle! Poetry elevates man above all separation and partiality by means of an agreeable, vivid presence of the objects; philosophy gives him firm, lasting principles in reference to them, and, if he still needs them, history will not refuse to give him maxims."

Just as formerly his poetical view of the world, so now too his historical-philosophic sense gives the means of judging of the influence to be exerted on the formation of the religious ideas; for since the error and partiality of *Rationalism* consisted in this, that, with a disregard for an historical foundation and development, it wanted to set a religion of reason in place of the existing religion; and the error and partiality of the *Orthodoxy* of that time in this, that it only clung to the historical as dead precepts. Herder had already made progress towards a real mediation between the two, in not being able on the one hand to conceive of anything developed and really present in man, which had not been acquired through instruction, through history, through divine communication and revelation, nor on the other hand, of anything, which had come altogether to and into him from without, unless there is something analogous in man himself, with which he recognizes that of which he may obtain a knowledge (which exists for him), receives it, reflects on it, developes and advances it, as much as he is able. He thus, for instance, attacked, in his prize-essay on the Origin of Language, the apparently pious, but really mechanical view, that man received language altogether as a divine communication, whilst he himself thought that the origin can only be properly regarded as divine, in so far as it is human. In general, there was not that contrast between the divine and hu-

man for Herder, which is usually thought of in connection with these words, according to which God backs all that is human and man all that is divine, or at least only an external approach of the one to the other takes place; he wanted to see the divine brought about or mediated through the human, and the human glorified and ennobled by the divine. To him all was divine and all human, according to the view you take of the matter. We have called Herder a priest of the purely human, a priest of humanity. We will pursue this thought farther, before we contemplate him as a theologian.

Let us now embrace poetry, philosophy and history, which we have thus far contemplated as separate branches of his nature and activity, in that one word which he emphasized more than any other, which he continually had in his mouth, but still more in his soul, in the word *Humanity.* This word, like the word tolerance and similar party words, became a shibboleth of that age, and therefore it is necessary, that here with the representative of humanity we also obtain a clear idea of the word, with which a great part of modern history is connected, that we consider the relation which this modern humanity has taken to the Christianity and Protestantism of the age. We properly ask in the first place: What did Herder himself understand by the word? Herder knew very well that a word does not decide a matter and that an odium is easily cast upon the word; but still he knew none that was better.* The dignity of human nature, he thought, is a characteristic of our race, to which it must first be brought by education. The beautiful word philanthropy, he thought, had become so trivial that the human race is mostly loved, so as really to love no one among men. He therefore chose the foreign word humanity. In it he sees the character of our race which, however, is only potentially innate, and which must properly be acquired by cultivation. "We do not bring it," he says, "really with us into the world, but in the world it ought to be the aim of our striving, the sum of our efforts, our dignity. The divine in our race is therefore cultivation, leading to humanity; all great and good men, lawgivers, inventors, philosophers, poets, artists, all noble men in every rank of society have aided in this work by the education of their children, by the performance of

*See especially the letters on humanity, and the ideas for a history of the philosophy of the human race (Werke zur Phil. und Gesch. Vol. III, p. 217).

their duties, by example, conduct, precepts and doctrines. Humanity is the treasure and profit of all human labors, the art, as it were, of our race. The education, leading to it, is a work which must be carried unceasingly, or we sink, higher and lower classes, back to rude brutishness and barbarity." He does not regard humanity as old as the human race. Whilst the notion of man brings to mind his weakness and frailty, it also calls to mind his human nature, his sympathy with his fellow men. Knowledge of human nature, development of man's powers and talents in a manner conformable to this nature, the gathering of all, called man, into the one city of God which is governed by only one law, the law of common (universal) reason, this is according to Herder the task to be performed by Humanity. "I wish," he says, "that in the word Humanity I could comprehend all that I have heretofore said about man's noble education, leading to reason and freedom, to the filling and the dominion over the earth; for man has no nobler word for his design, than he himself is." So far Herder himself.

Now we may ask, is not all this the object of Christianity? Certainly. Herder too regarded it in this light. "*Christianity,*" he says, "*commands the purest humanity in the purest way.*" But why then, we ask further, beside the preaching of Christianity, that of humanity? The answer to this question can best be given historically, and therefore permit me to give this historical explanation of the relation of Humanity to Christianity and Protestantism, as a supplement, as it were, to Herder's life. Christianity is of course the religion of the human race. Christ the son of man is also the best friend of man and his spirit the true educator of Humanity. But we know, how soon these simple ideas were lost sight of, how the Christian doctrine had been alienated from man by the accumulation of heterogeneous precepts, and how from a misunderstanding of the doctrines of natural depravity, it was believed, at one time, that man ought to be deprived of his human nature, whilst at another the superhuman was demanded of him. Christianity of course requires more than the mere cultivation of the natural man; it wants the *restoration of man to the image of God.* In this respect it differs from Humanity in the ancient, ante-Christian sense. It knows an old and a new man. We are to lay aside the old man, destroying himself with his lusts, and are to put on the new man, formed after the image of God in righteousness and holiness. But this new man created in God's image is

again to become natural for us through God's grace; Christ is to live in us, the inner man is to renew himself day by day, and this new man is not to fit us merely as a new dress, in which me move stiffly and feel uncomfortable but is to become a second nature to us, is to conquer the old that is in us and to permit us to take sure, free steps, as those that are regenerated, called, and illuminated, even as the sons of God. For a long time, however, Christendom did not comprehend this becoming-natural of the supernatural, this entering of the divine into the human and the elevation of the human to the divine. The old variance between the human and the divine always appeared again, persons always thought they were accomplishing something particularly holy by stifling, dislodging and wrenching human thoughts and impulses; hence the excrescence of monkish piety in the middle ages which disowned human nature; hence the abortion of scholasticism which turned the mind away from a healthy contemplation of itself and nature. These phenomena, though they had grown on Christian soil, were in opposition to humanity. The Reformation restored the divine, as well as the human, to its rights. Indeed, even before this, the interest in human affairs, for human life and efforts had been awakened by the restoration of the sciences and the revival of the study of the ancients; still this *humanism* (as we call it to distinguish it from the modern "humanity)" was not sufficient, since it connected itself too much with the old word of the Grecians and Romans and only externally with Christianity. A greater revival, proceeding from the deepest religious experience, and a regeneration, proceeding from faith were necessary, which actually occurred in the Reformation. But how was Humanity related to this work of the Reformation? We do not deny, that Luther had a sense for the purely human, for it often appears in him in its most lovely *naivete.* But this very *naivete* indicates that the purely human never came to consciousness in him. His sense for the human, as such, recedes far behind his enthusiasm for the divine purposes he served, and in his position this was very proper.* The harshness of his natural disposition may also have hid many pure expressions of the humanity in him, whilst the calmer, finer Melanchthon rather makes the impression of a human theologian. Afterwards humanity was, however, again driven

*Schenkel in his "Wesen des Protestantismus" has shown that in Luther's Christology the human does not receive its due.

from theology. The rough, heartless quarrels frightened it away, and only a few noble men, like Valentine Andreae (a favorite of Herder), projected with their bright human physiognomies above the heads of the combatants. Neither was pietism, though it accomplished much good, compared with the old orthodoxy, exactly distinguished for Humanity. It is true that in its earliest period, in the days of Spener and Francke and, still later, it developed a great deal of active philanthropy, and its grand institutions are in the highest degree, institutions of Humanity and noble witnesses of the same. But the other, the more ideal side of Humanity, that open sense for the most various human developments, for the cultivation of all talents, the artistic too in one word, the sense for the beautiful, was wanting in pietism. It was, therefore, reserved for the eighteenth century to understand, to cherish, to exercise and vivify this sense, which then awakened on every hand and manifested itself in all the tendencies; and in this century it was Herder who took the lead and opened a new way. What the philanthropy of Basedow had commenced awkwardly and in a rough manner and what the noble Iselin had already attempted in a finer way but only in timid intimations and to a more limited extent, that Herder now accomplished through his deeper truth, his nobler tendency and the greater extension of his works, and thus Herder promoted the cause of Evangelical Protestantism, since he, as it were, introduced Humanity into it, and humanized the Reformation.

But everything has its shady side, and we dare not close our eyes against the fact that the enthusiasm for *Humanity*, every where met with, at that time, could easily take a wrong direction, and that that which was intended to become a member in the history of the development of Evangelical Protestantism produced disagreeable effects, where it, severed from the whole, developed in a poetical manner. From the very effort and zeal to seek only the man in man, man could finally not be found, and what Herder said of the beautiful word philanthropy could soon be said of Humanity—that many had it on their tongues, without even showing themselves human in life. The charm which always lies in the sound of a new word could lead many away from these simple Evangelical truths, and to look down upon Christianity haughtily as a lower grade of Humanity, if indeed it did not appear to their eyes like barbarity. What was called Humanity of course was opposed to the limitations of nations and confessions of

former times. Every one was to feel himself a man, and in this feeling all was to vanish, that separates the members of one nation from those of another, and the professors of one religion from the professors of a different one. If this were so understood, that it is only the partial, the selfish and the wrong which separates man from man under the garb of nationality and religion and which leads to contracted reserve and senseless hatred towards others, then the preaching of humanity was quite in place. But how easily this lauded humanity became indifferent to all that is popular and religious, and produced cosmopolitanism in politics and indifferentism in religion! How soon did the ideal love for the Patagonians and Iroquois supplant the active love for the neighbor; and how soon did the professors of humanity withdraw from the Christian community, in heart at least, and revile, in the most inhuman manner, all that was accomplished by the Church or proceeded from it! Whilst it had formerly been demanded that the man should be put off in order to become a Christian, it was now demanded that Christ should be put off in order to be—man. From what has already been said it must be evident, that this was not Herder's view. As far as the national is concerned, none had a more German heart than his, however susceptible and open his sense for all the different nationalities; and in reference to Christianity it might perhaps be acknowledged that in the latter part of his life he permitted what is *peculiar to Christianity* to disappear too much in its historic and dogmatic distinctness, before the idea of the purely human, as he called it. But of this we cannot judge, till we have learned to know Herder the theologian more fully. Let me here quote the proposition which Herder regards as the watchword of both Humanity and Christianity: "Whilst bad morality is satisfied with the proverb 'Every one for himself, no one for all;' the saying, 'No one for himself, every one for all,' is the watchword of Christianity"—and also of Humanity in Herder's sense of the word.

We have considered Herder the poet, the philosophical historian, or, if you prefer it, the historical philosopher, Herder the prophet and representative of Humanity, and have also attempted to explain the nature of humanity as a co-operating power in the department of mind. We now come to speak of Herder, the theologian. The above remarks had to precede in order that the present view we take of Herder might have a foundation; for Herder the theologian stands on the foundation that we have seen spread out before us, on

the foundation of a general human education, on the foundation of humanity. His theological were not separated from his other labors; he was not a scholar, who occasionally wrote poetry as a recreation; not a preacher who, when he had no preaching to do, gave himself up to the study of history as a favorite occupation. All was, as we have seen, the same to him. He was a theological poet and a poetical theologian. Poetry and prose, the spiritual and the natural, the scientific and the popular were given in and with one another by him. In his works, not theological, he was just as apt to appear too theological for the worldly-minded, as on the other hand too little theological to stiff professional men in his theological works, and to the anxiously pious too worldly. He has also drawn Theology into the sphere of what is purely human, into the sphere of Humanity. Bible and Christianity, divine in their origin, have been humanized to a certain extent by him. Persons may be frightened at this thought of humanization, but the fear will vanish or at least decrease, when we explain ourselves more fully. All depends on what you understand by the human, with what measure you measure man. If by the human you understand the bad, the frail, the sinful, the miserable, then indeed it sounds like blasphemy to call Christianity a human religion and the Bible a human book; then it would amount to this: What you have regarded as divine till now, and venerated as such, is an empty human work, a human invention, an arbitrary despotic command, sheer deception. Such language was indeed made use of already before Herder's time and has been used at all times. But whoever thinks that Herder, in the least, chimed in with such language would only show his ignorance of the thoughts of the great man. Herder wanted the very opposite. The Bible which so many labored to remove as an obsolete, incomprehensible book, as an arsenal of old prejudices, this very Bible he labored to place as the candle in the centre of the sanctuary, just as Luther had done in the days of the Reformation. The despised, the reviled form of the son of man which the meanest souls ever thought they had a right to deride, he wanted to revive again before the eyes of the world and so present in its innate glory, His majesty in the form of a servant, and (of course in a different sense from that of Pilate) to exclaim, "Behold the man!" He wanted to proclaim the fact that he too knew no other name, by which men can be saved, than the name Jesus Christ.

All the efforts of Herder appeared to be apologetical and

displayed a fresh courage to defend the divinity of the Bible and Christianity in opposition to the spirit of freethinking. This we find especially in Herder's earlier writings, in the most decided, most powerful language, even at the risk of being regarded as a blockhead by the "Aufklärer." But it must certainly have grieved Herder, when the theologians, by their awkward defences gave weapons into the hands of their opponents, when they sought the divinity of the Bible and Christianity, where it ought not to be sought, when they were zealous for the letter, whilst they suffered the spirit to vanish, or again, when they, on the other hand, too easily abandoned what ought not to be abandoned and when they themselves assisted in bringing the Bible into disrepute by their artful and forced interpretation. Herder required of every person who wanted to have an opinion to express about the Bible and Christianity, that he should understand them clearly and should not cling merely to given words and conceptions, but should read the Bible, as it ought to be read, as a book which, with all its divinity, with its divine origin and divine ends, is still written by human hands for human beings, for a human eye, a human heart, a human understanding; as a book which, though written for all times, even for eternity, still refers to certain times and occasions and must be interpreted from these given times and occasions. This genuine, purely human view of the Bible, which Luther had already laid great stress upon, and in which light only it gains the favor of man, was again made conspicuous by Herder, and in this sense he began his letters on the study of theology with the words: "It is true, my dear sir! the best study of divinity is the study of the Bible, and the best reading of this divine book is human. The Bible must be read in a human manner, for it is a book written by men for men. The more humanly we read the Word of God, the nearer we come to the design of its Author, who created man in His image and acts humanly in all His actions and kindnesses, in which He manifests himself as our God." Each one must see that this human was not to be in the way of the divine, but was rather to serve as a support for it. And in how childlike a manner, how humbly did Herder himself open his heart and his mind to the divine Spirit which speaks to us through the Bible! "As a child," so he writes in his letters to Theophron, "hears the voice of its father, as the lover hears the voice of his bride, so we hear God's voice in the Scriptures and perceive the sound of eternity in it. . . . . Whilst God's Word

in the hands of the critic appears to me like a squeezed lemon; God be praised! it appears to me now again as a fruit, which flourishes on the living tree." However necessary Herder regarded a scientific method of treating the Bible and scientific inquiries in reference to it and its history; and however little he desired to check labors of this kind, to which such as Wetstein, Semler, Ernesti and others had given an impulse; still he was decidedly opposed to all hypercriticism, to all artificial and distorted interpretations, with which many at that time began to martyr the Bible.

He who was the first to hold the principle, that the Scriptures must be comprehended and enjoyed with a poetical sense, strongly opposed the levity of those who wanted to make the historical part of the Bible mere poetry. "Then," he says, "I would rather wish all poetry away and in its place the most naked and driest history." Thus here, too, his historical sense balanced the poetical. "Truly it is," Herder continues, "a fine thread which passes through the Bible, Old and New Testament, especially in those places, in which figure and fact, history and poetry are blended. Rough hands can seldom follow it, much less unroll it, without tearing and tangling it, without injuring either the poetry or the history, which are spun by this thread into one web. Then, indeed, interpreting belongs to God, or to that man, on whom the spirit of the gods, the genius of all ages and, as it were, the infancy of the race rests. If persons attempt it, who know nothing of this spirit, to whom nothing is more foreign than a poetical feeling, especially that of the Orient, and though they are the greatest dogmatists and critics in the world—the plant grows pale at their breath and withers in their hands." Truly golden words which ought to be placed in large letters over the judgment-seats of many critics of modern times!

This poetical feeling of the Orient, demanded by Herder, he himself possessed in the highest degree, and it assisted him in all his labors. It was not, however, a feeling acquired by study, but was experienced. Had Herder been so fortunate as to make a journey to the Orient, what a profit might then the Occident have gained! But even in the Occident Herder felt Oriental, because he everywhere looked for the key-note of nature with the susceptible feeling of the Orient. Thus his voyage from Riga to Nantes was a living commen-

tary to him, partly for understanding Ossian, partly, too, for understanding the Bible. "What great spheres of thought," he exclaims in his journal of travel, "does not a ship, hovering between heaven and earth, give occasion to think of? Here all gives thought wings and motion and atmosphere! The fluttering sail, the ever-moving ship, the roaring waves, the boundless view! On the earth, one is fixed to a dead point and is confined to a small place. Frequently the former is the student's chair in a gloomy room, the seat by a plain rented table, a pulpit, a lecturer's chair—often the latter is only a small city, with a uniformity of occupation. . . . Let one now suddenly step out, or rather let one be cast out without books, writings or occupation—what a different prospect! Where is the fixed ground, on which I stood so firmly, and the small pulpit and the student's and lecturer's chair, on which I felt myself proud? Where are those, whom I feared and whom I loved? O my soul! how will it be with thee when thou leavest this world? The narrow, fixed, limited centre has vanished, thou flutterest in the air or swimmest on a sea—the world vanishes from thy view—is gone! . . . A philosopher he even, who has learned to philosophize from nature but poorly, without books and instruments! Could I have done this, what a standpoint, sitting, under a mast on the wide ocean, to philosophize on heaven, the sun, stars, moon, air, wind, the ocean, rain, storm, fishes, the depth of the sea, and to discover the physics of all these. Philosopher of nature, this should be thy standpoint with the youth whom thou instructest!" And this standpoint Herder also sought to gain for his interpretation of the Bible. "The crew," he says among other things, "are always a people, who are chiefly attached to the superstitious and wonderful. Since they are necessitated to pay attention to wind and weather, to little indications and foretokens, and since their fate depends on phenomena in the heavens, sufficient occasion is given to notice little signs and forebodings and also to inspire them with a kind of reverential awe and induce them to study omens. . . . . What man will not pray during a storm in a fearfully dark night in tempests, in places where pale death dwells? Where human aid fails, man always falls back on divine aid. . . . Whoever believes and prays will, though he were in other respects a rough wicked fellow, in view of the objects on the sea have pious words in his mouth, and not ask how was Jonah in the whale's belly? for he considers nothing impossible for the

great God, although he may think himself able to make his own religion, and may reject the Bible. The entire ship-language, the waking, the change of the watch is therefore in such pious expressions and as solemn as a song from the belly of a fish."* Thus Herder studied his sublime philosophy, but also his exegesis and theology in the sea-breeze, among the sailors, as Luther in the Wartburg once reflected on his Bible, and pursued theological thoughts while in the chase. Such studies of nature, in the higher sense, have always promoted a sound divinity more than mere book-learning. The ideas, which Herder laid down in his "Oldest records of the Human Race," in which he took the Mosaic account of creation from the hands of those who want to see a mere compendium to physics in it, are indebted to these powerful impressions from nature for their origin. To him sunrise, as it appears anew every day, is the living picture of the first morning of creation, and as then nature gradually awakes, as fogs and vapor vanish and the earth and firmament continually become more definite and distinct; as gradually the vegetable kingdom unfolds itself, as the animals leave their hiding places and man awakes to consciousness—this was to him like the theme of Genesis repeated daily; herein he found the eternal truth of the six-days' creation. In a similar manner Herder viewed many other parts of the Old Testament. The poetical, living contemplation is always the most prominent, as it appears so beautifully in his work on the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, through which he gave a new impulse to the study of the Old Testament.

But Herder's theological character is only half understood, if we see in him only the ingenious interpreter of the figurative language of the old Testament, and the eloquent defender of the oldest revelations. We are particularly concerned to know Herder's Christian convictions and his more definite relation to the Evangelical Protestant Church, to its doctrines, its government, its entire development. Herder wrote no system of Christian doctrines;† he only explained isolated books of the New Testament, the Epistles of the brothers of Jesus, James and Jude; he has almost left entirely untouched the great treasure of Paul's Epistles which properly form the dogmatic foundation and kernel of the doctrines of the

* This is probably the correct reading instead of "Ship."

†Such a system was afterwards formed from his works with the title, "Herder's Dogmatics." Jena 1805.

Evangelical Church, though he esteemed the Apostle and his teachings very highly. He, however, understood more clearly than many in his day, that Christ himself is the centre of Christianity, not only the doctrine, but the *person* of Jesus Christ, whose image he was anxious to stamp on the souls of his hearers and readers, just as he bore it in his own soul.* Here Herder again followed his own course as might be expected. He had an aversion to all learned disputes about the divine and human nature of Christ and their union, because in such learned definitions he saw the death of all religion. Still he was fully convinced that in Christ, both the divine and human must be viewed, and these again in the most intimate union. The two works, "Of the Redeemer of Man" according to the first three Evangelists and "Of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world" (according to the Gospel of John) are supplemental to each other, so that in the one, the Son of man, the teacher, the prophet, is more prominent, and in the other, the Word of God revealed as man, Logos made flesh. Whilst those who made Christ a mere popular teacher, took offence at the Gospel of John and regarded it with suspicious eyes as the mine of mysticism, Herder on the other hand said "that little book is a still, deep sea in which . . the heavens with the sun and stars are mirrored, and if there are eternal truths (and such there are) for the human race, they are to be found in the Gospel of John." He did not fear the depth of the Christian mysteries; he required, however, that persons to enter them must be provided with an anticipating spirit and must be prepared to look into their depths, and not to approach them with the vain presumption of human criticism, which touches holy things with rough, unskilled hands. Here again he was assisted by his Orientalism. He attempted to explain the mystic expressions and sacred figures of the New Testament by means of the newly discovered oriental source of Zoroaster's teachings. But he did not stop with the figures; he insisted on the kernel, the con-

*"The kingdom of God," he says—the sermon as Weimar mentioned above, "and Christ's feast are not intended to be word and figure, but to become truth and reality: we are to taste and see what joys God has prepared for us in Jesus Christ, and in the entrance into his nature, to his feast of noble equality. In every act, every circumstance of life we ought to feel ourselves as brethren at the same table; in the will and love of the great King of the world we should rest as in the bosom of the Father, at the feast of our beloved. The elevated, quiet joy of Jesus, the spirit which breathes in the eternal kingdom of God, ought to speak through us, pass over to others and silently to testify of us."

tents, the fact, lying at the basis of the figurative expression. "It is evident," he says, "from the entire N. T. that Jesus must be regarded as the first active source of the purification, of the deliverance and of the blessing of the world, not with an 'as it were' or 'that was only so and so,' but in reality."

As Herder gave the advice, that the Bible ought to be read in a human manner, so he also preferred to make the human in Christ conspicuous, that is, the divine, as it appears in human relations and circumstances. Everywhere he calls attention to the fine, tender shades in Christ's character, as represented in the Gospels, and lets us, as it were, obtain glimpses of the divine through the human. As Jesus is to him the revealer and representative of divinity among men, so he regards him also as the representative of Humanity, always laying perhaps too much stress on the expression "Son of man." It may be that, if the sum is taken of all that Herder said about Christ, the human mode of view preponderates, yes, that this sometimes passes over into cosmopolitanism. Thus it may surprise some, when Herder says in various places, that Christianity would still continue, though the name of its Founder were forgotten. But there is certainly a difference between living under the shadow of a tree, yea, feeling ourselves branches of the tree and absorbing its nourishing sap, and merely receiving the fruit from a third person. This Herder must have known and felt. But why shall we conceal it? A thoughtful and impartial reader of Herder's writings cannot easily fail to discover, that the author in his later theological works, and exactly in those which are entitled "Christian writings," has here and there sunk from the height of that enthusiastic contemplation on which we behold him in the writings of his younger days; that he has approached very much the level regions of a mode of contemplation, which makes all even, wipes out all sharp outlines, without however, which is to be well marked, becoming flat himself.

Whoever reads this author with attention and does not merely admire and echo his sentiments, must find it possible to refute Herder with Herder; so that Gervinus in his "National Literature of the Germans" justly remarks, that with all love and regard for him one can frequently not be a follower of his without at the same time becoming his opponent. This was the case with the most intimate friends of Herder, as Hamann, who accused him of leaving his former principles. But we would as little like to say on this account with

Niebuhr, that Herder ever ceased to be religious, as to denote with Gervinus this period of greater sobriety as his brightest period. We rather agree with the editor of Herder's works, J. G. Mueller, when, in his Preface to the Christian writings, he says: "The spirit in which these writings too have been written is pure, open, honest, noble, towards the holy reverential, and in this respect certainly truly Christian. As nowhere, so here, too, Herder never dissembles. Christianity was to him a matter of the heart from his youth. Every reader of these writings will feel this, who has an ear for the language of the heart and of conviction. Love of God and of the truth are the spirit of Christianity, and he, who has these, perhaps losing nothing, if here and there in less important matters his views do not quite hit the truth. Who has ever known it fully?"

What interests us particularly in Herder and also enables us to overlook the change and shades of his views, to a certain extent, is this, that he did not place the essence of religion in dogmas as such, but separated it from them. Whilst others still made religion a matter of the head or an empty external show and performance, he made it a matter of the heart. "Dogmas," he says, "separate and irritate, religion unites. Let words and syllables be idolized, and the intoxication will last for a while; then it ceases and the naked scaffold remains. Religion on the other hand is a living fountain; though it be dammed up and obstructed, still it will break forth out of its depths and purify itself, will quicken and animate." "Religion is (this Herder knew distinctly before it was confirmed by Jacobi and Schleiermacher) a matter of the soul, of the inmost consciousness; . . . . it is the marrow of a man's disposition, . . . . the most careful conscientiousness of his inner consciousness, the altar of his heart." We will not, therefore, stop to learn Herder's dogmas one by one, or to harmonize them, where they appear to contradict each other. He was not a school-dogmatist and did not want to be one, though he knew how to estimate the scientific value of exact definitions in their place. He regarded the *character* more than knowledge in the man, as well as in the scholar, in the Christian as well as in the Theologian. "I think," he says, "the most important thing in our being is *character*, not knowledge and science. These are only finely ground instruments, with which much good, but also much that is useless and injurious may be done; it depends on the hand that uses them. It is, for instance, imma-

terial for practical purposes, whether I understand a moral truth, symbolically or in a general form; it is sufficient if I understand it in a living manner and obey it."

Let us therefore examine Herder's theological character more closely, whilst we see him moving in his practical theological sphere, as preacher, as pastor, as superior of the Church and as schoolman. Certainly, no one has ever called Herder a pietist. But still he had this in common with pietism and its founder Spener, and also with Luther and the other Reformers, that he required more of the minister than a mere scientific or learned preparation or speculative mis-preparation, since he regarded piety,—a Christian piety, nourished by Scripture,—as the soul of Theology. "A Theologian," Herder says, "ought to be reasonably well educated and ought to learn from childhood the Bible as practical religion. He ought early to have the example of pious, active parents, and to use all diligence, like Timothy, to become an active man of God, skilled in doctrine and in life. Boorish, rough and wild manners, low aims of avarice, of pride, indolence and other wrong motives, on account of which Theology may be chosen, are injurious to an understanding as well as to a feeling and application of the truth. No ray of light can pierce through a hard earthen vessel; much less can such a vessel be made a mirror to reflect light to others." "Let prayer and reading of the Bible," so he advises the young theologian, "be your food morning and evening." "A taste for God and divine things, this is the genuine study of Theology." . . . . "A quiet fervor, a heart warm, innocent, modest, but still high and noble in its aspirations!"—this he valued above all other things in young men who devoted themselves to the ministry. And how high and noble were Herder's ideas of this office! I have already mentioned in my former Lectures, that the tendency of time was to make all things practically useful, and that even the pious and well-meaning Spalding assisted this tendency in his work, "On the usefulness of the Ministerial Office." Herder esteemed the author himself highly, and indeed never attacked the book directly; but it was the occasion of his attacking forcibly low views of the ministerial office. This he did in the Provincial papers. The patriarchs of the old Covenant, the priests and prophets, Christ and his apostles—these he regarded as the patterns for all ages, whose example even the poorest preacher of the Word ought to follow. He ought to imitate them, and not pliantly accommodate himself to the

requirements of an effeminate and secularizing age. These were Herder's views on the duties of the ministry. He regarded the office of the preacher, as God's office. To him all real wisdom rests on Theology as its deepest root. It was a very repugnant thought to Herder, that preachers ought only to be teachers of wisdom and virtue, as the spirit of that age asserted. "Why then," he asks, "do you not come down from your pulpits, which are clumsy chairs for teaching? . . . . Of what use then are these Gothic buildings, these altars, etc. No! religion, true religion must return, or a preacher will continue to be the most indefinite, the idlest and most indifferent thing on earth. . . . Teachers of religion! true ministers of the Word of God! what a work have you to perform in our century! The harvest is great, but unfortunately the laborers are so few." . . . "But in order to aid in this matter," the animated speaker continues, "it must be believed that there is a *revelation of God in the Bible* and also in the course of the human race, and thus we must naturally always and everywhere come back to the great centre, around which all revolves and arranges itself—Jesus Christ, the Corner-stone and Heir, the greatest Messenger, Teacher, Pattern, but also according to his person the Corner-stone of salvation, on which we must found all that the other world will approve."

Whilst it was the tendency of the times to separate religious instruction from history and use the latter merely as a collection of examples for morality, Herder recommended as strongly as possible the history of religion, as the foundation of religious education, on which all must be based. For him the beautiful plant of God grows from the living seed of the facts, of history; its soil is revelation, its main sap and power, faith. Interpretation of Scripture is, however, to be the principal business of the preacher; not mere preaching and reasoning on morality." "If morality," he says, "is the chief business of the preacher, and the Bible, and words of Jesus are mere quotations which come from God, just as all truth comes from Him,—then farewell Christianity, religion, revelation—the names become polite masks, and that is about all." Then, he thought, we might as well preach from Seneca and Epictetus as from the Bible. Therefore Herder also disapproved very much, that pulpit eloquence was modelled after worldly heathen patterns, after Demosthenes and Cicero," who treated entirely different subjects, had different audiences and aimed at results also very different. He, therefore, rejected

all those theories of pulpit eloquence, with which the literature of the day began to teem, as a miserable invention of the age. He himself in preaching, despising all vain display, adopted the simple form of explaining Scripture, the oldest form, the homily. According to the testimony of those, who saw and heard him, his appearance in the pulpit was very imposing, though he did not assist in this with gestures, but on the contrary stood almost motionless; but the expression of his voice must have been powerful. Let us hear an unsuspected witness on this subject. A witty author of those days, Helfrick Peter Sturz, a man by no means agreeing with Herder's writings, says the following in a letter: "I have heard Herder preach in Pyrmont, and I wish all good Christians who, incited by their leaders, hate him so orthodoxly, could hear him. Our high-lived congregation was not in as susceptible a spirit of devotion as the primitive Churches, and yet you ought to have seen, how in a few moments he changed the bustle of distraction, curiosity and vanity to the stillness of a Moravian congregation. All hearts were opened, every eye was fixed on him and rejoiced in unaccustomed tears, only sobs of emotion were heard in the affected congregation. My dear friend! no one preaches in such a manner, or religion would be to all what it ought to be, the dearest, most confidential friend of man. He preached on the text of the day, without enthusiastic extravagance, with that enlightened, high simplicity, which does not need the figures and arts of the school to transcend the wisdom of the world. Nothing was explained, because all was clear, no reference was made to theological metaphysics, which neither teach how to live or die, but how to quarrel scientifically. It was no exercise of devotion, not an attack on hardened sinners, divided in three blows, nor any other of the current articles of pulpit manufacture; neither was it a cold heathen morality which only looks for Socrates in the Bible, and can therefore dispense with Christ and the Bible, but he proclaimed the faith of love, proclaimed by the God of love, which faith teaches us to be patient, to suffer, to persevere and hope and which rewards with its own peace and satisfaction, independently of all the joys and sorrows of the world. So I think, the followers of the apostles must have preached, who were not examined in dogmatics, and did not play with systems and compendium words, as children play with counters. You know how differently I think of Herder the author: we only

go together a short distance, then he escapes from me rushing, shining and quick as a rocket; but as a *preacher* and a *man* he is a true man, and on the short way which we can journey together, he is my dearest companion."

Herder did not write his sermons, but made mere sketches of them and from these the most is taken which we possess of him under the name of sermons. Herder's sermons are very peculiar and cannot be compared with others. His intentional deviation from the pulpit language goes so far, that he brings into his sermons all the expressions of common life, all foreign words, altogether adopts the language of common conversation and even gives free course to satire. Of many of his sermons we can scarcely believe that they have ever been preached. If they were to be read before an audience for edification they would shock every moment, but one may very appropriately read them alone. Herder's language in his sermons is so peculiar and so intimately connected with the relations in which he was placed, that it can by no means be recommended as a model for imitation. But the sermons recommend themselves so much the more; they elevate themselves above what are called model sermons, for their excellence does not consist in the regular, the methodical, but in the original, the individual, the characteristic, and these qualities can never be imitated.*

Herder's manner of preaching and sermonizing was connected with his views of worship in general, and in this department he also exerted an influence with his reformatory

*"Herder's sermons," W. von Humboldt writes in his letters to a friend, "were very interesting. They were always thought too short and were wished as long again. But those which I heard were not edifying; they touched the heart but little." Schiller in his correspondence with Koerner says: "The entire sermon (of Herder) was like a conversation which a person carries on by himself, very plain, popular and natural. It was less a discourse than a rational conversation. A proposition of practical philosophy, applied to certain particulars of common life, doctrine, which would as soon be expected in a mosque as in a Christian Church. The delivery was as simple as the contents of the sermon: no pantomime, no play of the voice, but an earnest calm expression. It can easily be seen, that he is conscious of his dignity . . . *Herder's sermon pleased me better than any other I have ever heard;* but I must honestly confess that no sermon pleases me." With this confession the criticism loses much of its force. Afterwards he accused Herder, that he preached of himself after his return from Italy and had a *Te Deum* sung on himself of which he (Herder) had composed the words, and had them scattered through the Church. It is to be hoped that this belongs to the gossipping mentioned above, in which Weimar life was rich; poor miserable wealth!

spirit. He had a great aversion to mere forms and ceremonies, no matter how fine and beautiful, externally. "It has alas!" he says in one of his sermons, "become so usual to confound devotion and a sleeping of the soul, piety and sluggishness of thought, that no one wants to think with the preacher, but each one wants the Spirit of God to think for him." Whatever, therefore, was not calculated to rouse the thinking mind and the moral powers of man, but only indistinct, gloomy feelings, found no advocate in him. He was most fond of the simplest, the truest, clearest and the most powerful in the divine service. Herder did not, however, regard public worship as a mere exercise of thought or a dry moral institution, but his poetical disposition led him to the truth here especially in reference to Church hymns and spiritual songs generally. . . . . Of his numerous poems few are intended for use in public worship, and of these but a small number can be sung by the congregation; they are Cantata, hymns or poems, free in their form. Herder never attained the proper spirit of Church hymns, because he lived in a time, to which this spirit was foreign. He was unwilling to imitate, and the most gifted cannot create, if the age does not support him.

We have now gained the standpoint from which we can view Herder's position in reference to the history of the development of Evangelical Protestantism, and from which we can also determine what link he forms in the chain of this development.

As we have already found the essence of Protestantism to consist in this, that the spirit striving for progress, greater freedom and clearness boldly follows its course in spite of all the enmity and suspicions of erring judgments; that with all this progress, however, it looks back to the foundation once firmly laid, that it does not only find pleasure in protesting, but rather builds on and alters than destroys, and therefore opposes, as far as possible, all violent and forcible reforms and revolutions with calmness; we have in Herder the picture of a true Protestant, a Protestant adapted to the age in which he lived. We find in him both a man of progress and yet conservative, a man of ancient and modern times, in so far as he was adapted to bring forth things, both old and new, out of his treasure and to mediate the two in an intellectual manner. This must be evident from the representative of his theological system and his theological mode of thinking and acting, with which we have been occupied in the pre-

vious Lecture. Compared with the violent modern minds and the Aufklärer, Herder is orthodox, and compared with the stiff orthodox he is a bold modern mind. Vulgar Rationalism will make him out a mystical supernaturalist, and vulgar Supernaturalism a dangerous rationalist, against whom one can not be too well guarded. But it must be so and always will be so, where a genuine reformatory spirit lives and acts. It was so with Luther, who in opposition to the Pope appeared an enemy to peace and order, even as a rebel, and in opposition to the rebels as a servile subject of princes and a despot in matters of religion. There will always be men for whom genuine Protestantism goes too far, and again others for whom it does not go far enough. But it would be very unjust to charge Herder with a characterless *halfness.* The true medium, to which Protestantism and also Herder belong, differs from the false medium, which of course often calls itself the right and true medium, in this, that it does not vacillate, without principle and character, between the extremes, but that it holds a firm definite position above the extremes; that it moves neither to the right nor the left; that it does not reject every means of reconciliation harshly and peremptorily, but yields where it ought to yield, and clings at the peril of life to what it ought to hold, and that it is conscious of what it does, and with all apparent inclination in this or that direction, neither loses sight of its object, nor its centre of gravity.

In order that we may estimate Herder's Protestant disposition, we must still view him in his practical sphere, in which we have just left him. We have learned to know him as preacher and religious poet. In his views of Church hymns his genuine Protestant spirit revealed itself; on the one hand his Lutheran heart, which felt itself grown together with the roots of Protestantism, felt itself one with the vital nerve of the Reformation, and that would not permit itself to be robbed of the faith of its fathers by the first whim of the custom and taste of the age; on the other hand, however, a free, open, calm, incompatible glance, which knows how to discover the errors of the old as well as the good of the new, and which therefore knows no close in the productions of the Christian life and spirit, but always expects further developments in the distant future and assists in producing them. With the contemplation of Herder, as preacher and poet, we have not yet exhausted the practical activity of the man. The large field of Church-direction, which was open to him

as general superintendent, the management of the Church-business and especially the reform of the school system, for which he labored as part of the duties of his office and also from love, are still to be considered. Here we come in contact with the preserving spirit of Herder, which protected the old and authentic in all its greatness, in a time, too, which thought it could not remove too much of the old.

We have already seen from Herder's relations in Bückeburg, how conscientious he was in his pastoral duties. But in Weimar, too in the city of polite scholars he ventured to advocate the old church discipline, which had become unfashionable. And in this matter he placed himself directly on the true foundation of old approved Protestantism. What had made the Reformation necessary, but the sale of indulgences, the redemption of sins through money? What had at that time proceeded from the Pope now proceeded from the haughty, frivolous spirit of the age. Many of the rich and educated thought they could redeem themselves from Church discipline through money and fines. Herder protested against this. Regardless of the judgment of the members influenced by rationalistic tendencies, he says: "The penance and censorship of the Church, taken purely in the Scriptural, apostolical sense, according to which public stumbling-blocks are removed from the communion of the Church and repenting sinners are received again, ought by no means to be laid aside, nor to be changed into anything which it is not intended to be, as long as the Bible exists and we believe in a communion of saints, which consists in forgiveness of sins, according to the third article of the Apostles' creed, or pretend to believe it. From this no rank is to be excluded, no one is to be excepted; for there is no rank in Christianity. Soldiers, court-officers, princes and ministers are Christians; no sin can be redeemed with money, and no prince can except sins and excuse them."

Strict as Herder's views were on this subject, they were just as strict in reference to the licentiousness of the press and the abuse of the so-called freedom of instruction. At this time, in which the free word and free press are the party-words of an unbounded reformatory tendency of the age, it may not be amiss to hear Herder's views on this subject. "That all which calls itself science," Herder says, "ought to be suffered without inspection and direction in a state; I believe no old lawgiver would ever have thought of such a freedom. It is undeniable, that there are abuses of science which can only

adorn themselves with impudence, wantonness and licentiousness, and which are certainly injurious to the morals and thinking of a community. Whoever will, let him excuse public blasphemy or, which is just as bad, a reviling of sound reason, honesty and virtue, ever praise it if he like; but the State is not only at liberty, but in duty bound to defend and preserve its members against these. In respect to the soundness and blessedness of certain points in thinking all are agreed; the government must now suffer itself to be driven from these points, or it will go to destruction. This is the more so, because the very seed of such insects is corrupt and is anxious to lead the whole to ruin, in which it frequently results. The body, which has been left by the regulating spirit, whose pulse has ceased to beat and whose consciousness is gone is unquestionably the prey of corruption. Let us suppose that blasphemous, wanton, scandalous writings are allowed to be published by the State, whom will they influence? None but the weak, the sick and unprotected part of the State, the very persons on whom the influence will be most injurious. The steady man, the thinking, honest, industrious citizen scornfully casts such things aside and nothing is to be feared on his account. But the idle tenderling, the weak woman, the inexperienced youth, perhaps even the innocent child, will read them; the more elegant, more beautiful and attractive they are, the more they will be read by these persons and the worst influence will be exerted on this class of readers. . . . . *The State is the mother of all the children* and ought to take care of the health, the strength and innocence of all." "Every science," Herder continues, "has its abuse. . . . . *Philosophy may lead to such bad results by false reasoning*; *criticism may become so rude, impudent and villainous;* history so false and distorted in its application, that the government ought not always to remain indifferent to see so much talent misused, true science decreasing and the false increasing, so many impediments placed in the way of the former, and so many retreats offered to the latter, and finally to see all the good influence of literature destroyed." 'Does it not seem to every one, as if Herder spoke in *our* age and to *our* age? I, at least, can find nothing illiberal in this nor in his dramas which he wanted to be placed under a strict censorship, and cannot, therefore, agree with Gervinus, when, in his National Literature of the Germans, he compares these and similar severe Lectures with the blustering polemics of the superintend-

ents general of the seventeenth century. I, of course, recognize in it something of the same spirit of discipline, of order, of lawfulness, which however, belongs to the Spirit of Protestantism; I even recognize in it the spirit of Luther. Herder knew that he agreed with Luther in this respect, and appealed to him with a good conscience, where he attempted to show, that change of government is not necessarily an improvement of it, that Ochlocracy is the worst tyranny, and that it ought to be the pride of the Germans, not to imitate the French in reference to loyalty and faith and old discipline and customs. Herder properly attempted to form this feeling of loyalty from the very foundation and to lay its basis in the schools; for he regards education as the impelling power of the nations.

We shall have occasion hereafter to form an estimate of Herder's pedagogical views which he developed most fully in his school-addresses and in which he was far from agreeing with the *enlightening* philanthropy. We now leave Herder for some time, without, however, losing sight of him for he will frequently be of service to us as a magnitude with which we are acquainted and by which we can measure other magnitudes, as a person whom we have placed at the entrance of the garden, by whom we may find our way out again in the various labyrinths of the same.

We now turn our attention to another subject. As we must follow the course of modern German philosophy, we must now turn to that point, where this development commenced, to Kant. It may appear strange that we speak of Kant *after* Herder; for though they were cotemporaries, still Kant was the older and was Herder's teacher. I have, however, done this intentionally; for Herder was far from being a follower of Kant; he rather appeared as an opponent to him, and then in his entire education a greater influence was exerted on him by ancient times than on Kant, who tore loose from it as much as possible. Besides Herder, though the younger, had already gained a literary reputation before Kant's Critique had excited much attention, so that as an author he has seniority in his favor. But finally, and this is the main reason, Herder's personality seemed much better adapted to be the first contemplated in this course of Lectures, because it is so multiform and interesting, whilst with Kant the system, separated from his personality, will more especially require our attention. I had some scruples, too,

about commencing with a system, that is with, something lifeless, abstract. I wanted to lay a foundation of another kind first, and this Herder afforded. Strengthened and warmed by him, we may now approach the marble bust of the great thinker.

In 1769 Herder wrote an essay on the ideal of a school, in which he agreed with Basedow in some things, and of course attacked others. Like Basedow he censured the exclusive prevalence of the Latin language in the schools and called it Papistic-Gothic. It was his principle, as well as that of the new pedagogical science in general, that in the elementary instruction the child's attention must first be directed to what surrounds it, before the memory is burdened with names of things farther removed from it, and that therefore all instruction, if possible, must be in some way connected with life and the things surrounding the child. "It should be one of the principal objects of a teacher to give the boy living conceptions of all that he sees, speaks about and enjoys in order to place him in his world and to impress him for life with the enjoyment of the same."

But, however, much Herder agreed with Rousseau and Basedow in reference to that part of education merely human, and refering to the development of the consciousness of the world, he differed widely from them in reference to the awakening of the consciousness of God, in the principles of religious education. In this respect he stood on the positive foundation and wanted to have nothing to do with the arts, by means of which the children were prepared to approach God and of the tender roundabout way, on which it was thought they ought to be led to heaven. In direct opposition to the untimely philanthropinising and reforming, he says: "*Luther's Catechism must be thoroughly learned by heart and must remain forever.* Explanations on it are a treasure of duties and of the knowledge of human nature. Basedow may say what he pleases about the Jewish character of the ten commandments, they are a fine morality for children." He also defends the use of Biblical accounts, only select portions of which he wants, however, to be used for the first stages of instruction. Herder is firmly convinced that good Biblical instruction produces high regard and a knowledge of religion for life, and this he regards as the best means of creating a new Christian public. Just as Herder thought more deeply of religion than the realistic pedagogues of that age, so he also thought more profoundly of language

and philological studies. How could he who, so to speak, regarded language and reason as the same, value philological studies lightly; and though he opposed the excess of Latin, he estimated the study of the German very highly, and gave excellent hints for its improvement. Herder laid down his chief pedagogical principles later in the School addresses delivered at Weimar, which have been published under the name of "Sophron." In them there is, here and there, an echo found yet of the ecclesiastical tone, which continually became less and less in the New School language. Thus Herder is not ashamed to designate the Schools, the workshops of the Holy Spirit. "Our ancestors," he says, in one of these addresses, "called the Schools, workshops of the Spirit of God;" an old-fashioned appellation, and it will perhaps appear strange that I repeat it in our day and do not rather speak of the temple of Apollo, of the Muses and Graces. The appellation, however, properly understood, expresses something so noble and indeed more truly and deeply than all those idol-expressions of the temple of Apollo, of the Muses and Graces can possibly do.

According to Herder, all education is to aim at giving the man an inner power, an indwelling wisdom, a pure eye, a clear understanding, the Holy Spirit, without which all acquired knowledge and skill become idle apparatus or means of destruction. "How beautifully," he says, "does every trial of moral culture adorn the child and the youth!" Is there a more lovely brow and more beautiful eye than those, in which modesty and shame, uprightness, confidence, humility and love, the Spirit of God, dwell? Is there a more beautiful charm of the gestures and limbs than when they are anointed and anointed daily, with pure innocence and mild complaisance, as it were with the oil of joy for beautiful activity? The expression of the Hebrew youth in whom the Spirit of God dwelt from childhood, 'How then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God, the holy thing that is in me?' has something so beautiful and powerful, that it alone is able to keep a youth who has this holy thing within him, who recognizes himself a temple of the Holy Spirit, from all that is low, common and wicked. . . . . All distinguished men had this noble feeling, which was the very thing that distinguished them from the common man, and preserved them from all that is base and low. He was their shield and buckler, their counsellor and guardian, their warn-

ing friend, their ruling genius, which impelled them to take the narrow way, and to press through the straight gate, instead of taking the broad road of wanton fancy and concupiscence." . . . "Spirit of God," he exclaims, "return to our schools to lay a good foundation in the minds of the young, to form in them a firm and pure character, which cannot be led astray by wild immorality, bold impudence and saucy importunity, which now prevail in so many books.". .

"It is not good," he says in another place, "to moralize much with youth in religious instruction ; but it makes a living impression to explain the doctrines and the proofs clearly, and to support the rules of morality with reasons and examples of common life, and of biblical and other anecdotes." According to these principles he revised Luther's Catechism, which he preferred before the new-fashioned Catechisms, which moralized and reasoned much. "Of the twenty or thirty catechisms," he writes to a colleague, "which I had before me, I have used much, but I could not make one, the basis, because in the most a too unnatural, compounded, theological language prevailed, and in the rest the most shameful recklessness." Finally, Herder was also active in the arrangement of a Seminary for teachers in Weimar, and it will most likely not be without interest for our times, in which so much is said about public schools, and reforms in them, to hear the views of a man whom probably no one has ever numbered among the blockheads.

"The object of a Seminary is not to give young persons, who want to prepare themselves to become country school teachers, *a useless kind of enlightenment*, with which they will think themselves overwise, and with which they will sooner be of disadvantage than benefit to their future pupils ; for too much clearness and argument spread carelessly among ranks of society, in which they do not belong, promotes neither the welfare of the State, nor the happiness of the individual, but chiefly not of the private life of the poorer class. Still less is its object to procure young persons a comfortable living, etc. It is rather its only object, far from all the ostentation and pedagogical playthings of our age, to give young persons, who devote themselves to the profession of teaching, a convenient opportunity of learning from instruction and personal application, what is *necessary* and really useful for their future calling; for the best ability of a teacher is only acquired by *method* and *exercise*."

Herder, the great proclaimer of Humanity, was far removed from all the effeminateness of the so-called Philanthropinism. *School discipline* he regarded as a necessary requirement of a good school. A great number cannot exist together without order, without a strict arrangement and regulation. "A School which has much discipline, many and strict exercises in good, and all kinds of good, to which children are to be trained, that is a good school. A Gymnasium which daily becomes a wrestling place, both in virtues and abilities for noble young souls, which wrestle and practice diligently and with emulation, only that is a true and a good Gymnasium. Where there is not this discipline, this good exercise in science and morals, there is a dead sea, though in and around it dwelt all the Muses."*

## ARTICLE III.

### THE IMPERISHABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY, DEDUCED FROM ITS HOLD UPON THE PRACTICAL PRINCIPLES OF OUR NATURE.

By Samuel Sprecher, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, O.

The stability and prevalence of Christianity rest upon a mental necessity. All kinds of necessity are grounds of certainty. There is an absolute necessity, and when it is apprehended there is an absolute certainty of knowledge. It is dependent upon no power. No man can conceive it to be possible, even for Omnipotence to change it. There is a physical necessity, and when it is cognized, there is certainty of knowledge, within the range of nature. Nature has no al-

*This article and that on Fichte, contained in the last number of the Evangelical Review, form a part of the sketches of Philosophers and Eminent Literary men of Germany in their relation to Christianity, by one most able to discuss the subject. The list embraces also sketches of Schleiermacher, Goethe, Schiller, Gellert, Schelling, Kant, Hegel and others. We believe the translation of the whole series, published in a volume, would be an acceptable contribution to the literature of the Church.—Editor.

ternative to its action; it can no more change or originate any thing new than it could purchase itself. Its inward efficiency necessitates its processes, and the knowledge of this efficiency makes us certain of the processes. Its events are as sure as its doings; and will be everywhere and evermore the same, except as they are modified or suspended by a supernatural efficiency. And there are mental necessities, the cognition of which gives certainty of knowledge. Certain occasions of mental action being given, the effects are necessary and certain. No man, for instance, can doubt, that perceptions, thought, emotion will always be the result of the reciprocal action of mind and matter.

In some cases we can apprehend the law of mental action, and then we have speculative principles; principles which determine, as far as they go, all our knowledge, and afford a light for the satisfactory exposition of all the facts of consciousness. But some of these intellectual necessities have never been, perhaps, never can be apprehended; yet they exist, and though they do not give science, they do notwithstanding produce certain beliefs which are as invariable, as are the results of the clearest demonstration. Could we trace back these beliefs, we know, we would find their roots, in some mental necessity; for we know that, though all knowledge begins in experience, it does not end there; but leads us to the cognition of a mental constitution lying back of experience and making it possible for it to be. Chronologically, experience is first, but logically, an intellectual constitution must have been prior to it and conditional for it. Hence these mental necessities produce their effects as well before as after; when they are and when they are not, when they can and when they cannot be apprehended. For we know of those, that can be apprehended, that they condition and determine all intellectual phenomena in minds, which do not cognize them, as well as, in those which do. The only difference is that in the one case, the effect is knowledge, in the other belief; in the one a practical impression of the reality of things; in the other a scientific exposition of things; in the one practical, in the other speculative principles. Whenever impressions are made upon the mind, leading to mental action, these practical principles are as invariably determinative of the result as speculative principles; the effects of intellectual necessities not being, as we have seen, in every case, dependent upon our own apprehension of them. Whenever the mind comes in contact with appropriate objects, im-

pressions of reality will thus be produced, which cannot be eradicated or overborne by any merely speculative process.

Hence we know something to be imperishable. Though we cannot demonstrate their indestructibility, we are sufficiently convinced of their durability; we feel that they will be evermore. Though the future be dark, and in regard to most things, we know not, what a day may bring forth; yet it is not all uncertain. While its isolated facts and individual events are known only to the Omniscent eye, there are some well ascertained principles of human thought and action; practical principles which will, in the midst of the mutations of all other things, remain the same and which will exert a controlling influence, in the future, as they have done, in the past. There is a logic of life, around the principles of which all satisfactory and effective thinking of men, on all questions of greatest interest to them, as moral and spiritual beings, in all conditions and circumstances, will be found, at last, to have revolved; a logic, the principles of which must be assumed without a speculative apprehension of their grounds, in intellectual necessity; but whose conclusions will be constantly verified by experience; a logic, in which from premises, in present possession, conclusions may be infallibly drawn, in regard to some things, in all time to come. Success or failure, happiness or misery, are constantly and truly predicted, and necessarily result, according as men adopt or reject, obey or resist these principles. They will remain, whatever may be the fate of men. Principles live, and men die. Though inexplicable they are known to be comprehensive, and though assumed, they are invariable. No experience in life is possible without them; and all experience whether joyful or painful, must be made under their control. No matter how numerous the experiments of man, they will find, as the last result of their conduct, in weal or woe, that they must assume their existence, and that early recognition of them, and immediate obedience to them, would have saved for them a life-time of wearisome search, and procured for them the greatest possible satisfaction of mind and heart.

Among these practical principles are some which always come into play, whenever the Bible comes in contact with the human mind, and which, in the absence of all possible demonstration, and in spite of all speculative processes, give it an imperishable dominion and an unyielding hold upon the

human mind. There may be no possibility of demonstrating the truths revealed in the Gospel, or of discovering the fallacy of the speculative reasonings which may be raised against their reality. Yet, men will find that they must receive them or they cannot think satisfactorily on any of the subjects, most closely connected with their rational nature and their spiritual well-being. They will be perpetually driven to neglect their personal interest in these great subjects or to attempt the impossibility of ignoring some practical principle of their minds, until they receive these truths. All satisfactory philosophy, no matter how vast its range or comprehensive its attainments, must, at last, terminate, just where revealed religion begins; it must receive its exhibition of the spiritual relations and destinies of men, and admit the evidences of its divine origin, and the reality of its manifestations, or reject those practical principles of the mind, which, in all other cases of the kind, govern the belief and determine the action of the mind. If it would gain principles, by which it may comprehend the universe, in its origination and destiny and expound the meaning and end of human existence, amid all the "ills to which flesh is heir," with satisfaction and hope, it must find them in Christianity.

We propose to elucidate this truth; to show that Christianity lays hold upon these practical principles of our nature with so firm a grasp, that the human mind cannot be indifferent to its power to affect it, nor entirely free itself from its impressions, except by the suspension of all practical spiritual activity or the sacrifice of all satisfactory spiritual thinking; that it must sacrifice some of its practical principles and all of its peace; or admit its reality and yield to its claims.

In consequence of these practical principles, we have impressions in consciousness of the reality of objects, independently of any process of the understanding in reasoning. We are so constituted that, whenever any representation is made to a capacity of the mind, there is a phenomenon or appearance in consciousness, accompanied by the belief of the valid being of the object so represented. Our faculties are not infallible and illusions may occur, false impressions may be received, and these may be dissipated, but this will be done by showing that there has been some antinomy of intellectual faculties, or an absence of some of the necessary conditions of their action; and further than this, reasoning

can not go. The belief of the reality of any faculty, whether of the sense, the understanding or the reason, cannot be wholly eradicated from the mind. Men may neglect the means by which the impression is made or they may, by neglect, fail to realize the force of it, but they cannot destroy the belief of the reality of its object, while it has the attention of the mind. "All things will double one against another, and God hath made nothing imperfect." There is an inner and an outer world, "the I and the not I," and the action and reaction of these produce appearances, in consciousness, together with the belief of the reality, or valid being of those objects, whose mode of becoming known to us they use. Representations are thus made in consciousness from within and from without, from ourselves and from objects other than ourselves.

Thus there are in consciousness the phenomena of the qualities of an external world and of the operations of an internal world, and accompanying these, is the belief of the valid being of those qualities and of those operations, and of their being connected; the former in a common ground in the outer, and the latter, in a common ground in the inner world; the belief of the reality of constant substance, in which external qualities inhere, and producing cause to which external effects adhere; of a permanent source of the internal operations; of real mental being and of a real nature of things; of the reality of mind and of matter.

There are also thus produced, in consciousness, moral phenomena; the idea of right, of moral law, of a will in liberty, of praiseworthiness and blameworthiness, the feeling of obligation and of responsibility, of approbation and disapprobation, of complacency in virtue and reprobation of vice, together with the belief of the reality of moral being and moral relations, of an interior and an exterior moral world, the belief, that we, and beings like ourselves, though connected with nature, are not of it, but distinct from it, that our proper self is supernatural, not bound in the chain of cause and effect, which holds and controls all the operations of nature; but that we are free agents, spirits, capable of originating action from ourselves, in contravention of nature's impulses and appetites; that we are bound by an ultimate rule of right, grounded in spiritual worthiness, that the excellency and integrity of the spirit must not be bartered for any animal gratification or given up for any consideration whatever.

There are also thus produced, in the common consciousness, what may be called religious phenomena; the cognition of the supernatural and the superhuman, of Deity, of a personal Creator, who is in the world but not of it, who comprehends it in its beginning and end, and yet is distinct from it; the idea of the soul and of immortality, and the feeling of worship and accountability, accompanied by the belief of the valid being of these spiritual objects.

But the mind has been affected, not only by nature but by that which we believe to be above nature, by a supernatural world. Representations have not only been made in consciousness from within and from without, but also from above; by Christianity through the Sacred Scriptures.

In consequence of these representations, there are in the consciousness of those to whom they have been made, what might be called Christian phenomena, the ideas and feelings of personal accountability to a personal Judge; of sin, depravity, guilt, redemption, pardon, peace, joy, hope, love. The Bible begins with a representation of the creation, of man's primitive state and nature, and of his fall; and throughout the Old Testament, in various ways, impresses the attentive mind with the idea of sin and guilt, with the obligation and beauty of holiness, with the necessity and the hope of redemption and regeneration; and in the New Testament reveals, by descriptions of the life, teachings and death of Jesus, God manifest in the flesh, the real perfections of the Deity and the original perfections of Humanity, and the reconciliation of the Holy God and sinful man, through Christ. We know enough of the power of the Gospel, to conclude, that were there no special hindrances in the way; hindrances which are peculiar to this case, the effects of these representations would be as certain, as invariable and as decided, as in the case of those of the natural world; that the Christian phenomena would be always produced in consciousness together with the belief of the valid being of the things so represented. If there were special hindrances preventing the attention of the mind to impressions of the external world, there would be few distinct phenomena in the natural consciousness, and little conscious faith in the real existence of an external world. We can conceive of the possible case of a man's natural sense being so stupified, or of his mind being so absorbed by inner objects, that he would receive no impressions of the reality of an outer world. There are indeed actual cases of men, being

so shut up within themselves, so listless and idle, that they have comparatively few and faint impressions of the real nature of things around them. In no case is there the clear perception in consciousness or the full belief of the reality of the object perceived without the attention of the mind, without the operation of a distinguishing faculty. A clock may strike every hour of the day, in the presence of a man deeply absorbed in study, and through every other condition of a clear perception of sound and the belief of its reality is present, yet for the want of the attention of the mind, the impression entirely fails of this effect. And so moral depravity may stupify the spiritual sense, harden the religious susceptibility, and hinder the attention of men to the representations of spiritual realities; and thus their impressions may be comparatively faint. As there is a great difference between the degrees of the conscious apprehension of natural things, in different men; so it is manifest there must be a great difference, in the first instance, perhaps during the whole of the present life, between the degrees of the vividness of appearances in consciousness and the strength of belief in the valid being of the objects represented, in these two cases; for men have no natural dislike of natural realities, while there is abundant evidence, that they are alienated from God and have a repugnance to spiritual things. The Apostle is manifestly right when he ascribes the stupidity of men in regard to natural religion, not to the want of any natural faculty for the supernatural or to any want of evidences of the existence of God, but to the moral depravity of men. "Because that which may be known of God, is manifested in them, for God hath shown it unto them; for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." And Jesus recognized this fact as a hinderance to the Gospel. "He that is of God heareth my words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." We have a spiritual eye or sense, as well as a natural eye or sense; but, in the former case a blindness and a stupidity has manifestly been superinduced, which has not happened in the same degree to the latter, and hence, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit, for they are spiritually discerned." But much as men neglect the representations of the Bible; compared with the attention which they give to

nature, it does produce great impressions upon all who have come within the reach of its influence. The objects, which it represents, are so suited to the natural and real wants of men, that they can no more be entirely indifferent to them, than they can be to the light which they see, or the air which they breathe. These representations are penetrative; "for the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." It, no doubt, produces, the Christian phenomena more or less, together with the belief of the reality of their objects in the minds of all, with whom it comes in contact. The object of the Bible is to produce faith; and God says, "My word shall not return unto me void; but it shall accomplish that whereunto I sent it." The belief is real, but it is not always saving faith. It is an awful test, like the sun of heaven, if it be not properly received it may blind the eye, like the forces of nature, resisted, it may destroy. "If your Gospel be hid," says the Apostle, "it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the God of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not, lest they might behold the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." It does make impressions, whether they be saving or otherwise depends upon the voluntary choice of him upon whom the impression is made. It must make some conscious impression of the reality of the objects which it represents or the consequences of the acceptance or the rejection of its requirements could not be so great as the Apostle thinks; for his language in regard to his own preaching of it is: "Thanks be to God who always maketh us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us, in every place; for we are unto God, a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one a savor of life unto life, and to the other a savor of death unto death." That impressions more or less deep and a belief more or less conscious, is produced in the minds of all whose attention has been at all given to the Bible, is manifest, to all who have closely observed the conduct, in hours of trial and danger, of even the most reckless of men; impressions that are indelible and will always be the basis of the happiness or misery, of the subjects of them, in reference to the moral government of God. This is evident also from the fact that, its efficacy has been experienced by thousands of obedient sub-

jects. The Apostle says, "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord." In the attentive subject of its representations, the Bible produces the phenomena of conviction of sin, and the sense of forgiveness, the evidences of spiritual renewal and the hope of everlasting glory, together with a faith in the reality of the objects of these phenomena, which is well defined as, "the evidence of things not seen and the substance of things hoped for." He experiences communion with God; "having been justified by faith, we have peace with God and access unto him through that grace wherein, we stand." He realizes through the instrumentality of the Bible the fulfilment of the promise, of the Saviour that He would come with the Father and take up his abode with him, and of the Apostle's declaration: "Ye are the temple of the living God," as God hath said, "I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." It effects an actual and conscious communion with God; Christ is said to "dwell in our hearts by faith." Just as the contact of the outer world produces the appearance of its qualities, in consciousness together with such a practical belief of its valid being, that it may be said to dwell in us, to fill our capacities with its qualities, so the contact of Christ with the soul, by means of the representatives of his word, produces in us a consciousness of his excellencies, with such a lively faith in the reality of his person, that he may be said to dwell in us, to fill our soul with his glorious attributes. The natural sense is improved by use; so is the spiritual. "To him that hath shall be given, that he may have more abundantly; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." This must be true everywhere, and now, if men would generally use the capacity which they have for spiritual things, and would follow the dictates of consciousness, in the moral and religious impression which even nature makes upon them; if they would do the will of God only so far as the "law is written upon their hearts, would they not be likely generally to realize the truth of the Saviour's declaration, "If any man will do the will of my Father in Heaven, he shall know of this doctrine whether it be of God." The validity of the impressions made by the Bible according to him, is to be determined and can be determined, in the same way in which, our belief in the reality of the objects of natural consciousness is determined, name-

ly by the practical principles, of our nature. Speculative proof may not be possible, and it is not necessary in either case; certainly not in one more than in the other. It is not by the state of our ideas, but by the state of our affections, that we become fully capacitated to receive the impressions and the faith of the Gospel. "Ye have received not the spirit which is of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that ye might know the things that are fully given us of him." If men were as full of love for the holy realities of the spiritual world, as they are of the love of visible objects, they would receive from the representations of the Bible, as clear and lively apprehensions of them, and as unwavering and indestructible a belief of their valid being. This is the only condition that the Apostle presents: "That ye, being rooted and grounded in love, might be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the height and depth and length and breadth, and know the love of Christ which passeth all knowledge (all speculative knowledge) and be filled with all the fulness of God." The consciousness of the Christian phenomena and the belief of them can thus, we see, be produced not by the speculative but by the practical principles of our nature. This result follows from a careful and affectionate attention of the mind, either to visible things, or to spiritual things. Who would wonder that a man, who (were it possible) had been entirely removed from impressions of the sense, might be engaged, in vain, in speculative attempts to receive, in consciousness, the phenomena and the belief of the reality of the properties of an external world. And shall it be a matter of wonder and a reason for doubting the efficacy of the Scriptures to produce in human consciousness the Christian phenomena, and faith in the valid being of their objects, that men, who do not apply their spiritual capacities to the Bible, but spend their lives either in entire neglect of religious interests, or study them only speculatively, do not experience it? Those, who love the Bible and who study and practice its precepts, believe as firmly in the reality of the spiritual objects which it represents, as they do in the valid being of the material world.

Now the belief, which accompanies the phenomena of natural consciousness, is indestructible. Illusions may occur; but notwithstanding this liability to obscure and even deceptive appearances in consciousness, we never lose our faith in the valid being of the objective world. By certain apparent demonstrations the conclusion may be brought out, that it

does not exist, and that if it did, we could not know it, and yet such is the force of the practical principles of our nature, that the philosopher himself, who has led us by a speculative process to this conclusion, admits that practically and actually this belief remains in the mind, and that the mind can never free itself from it. In the same way the belief of the realities of the objects of the Christian consciousness is imperishable, notwithstanding our liability to religious delusion, and against all reasoning to the contrary, it remains; we may forget, but we cannot destroy it.

These beliefs must be the same in kind, however much they may differ in degree; and they must be equally indestructible, because, in the first place, they are produced in the same way. All knowledge begins in experience, or by some phenomena or appearance in consciousness. There could be no consciousness without some contact of the "me and the not me"; or without something to awaken or arouse the mind to action; and whenever this occurs, there is a phenomenon in consciousness; together with the intuitive belief of the reality of the object, which impresses us, and of the mind which is thus impressed. These convictions of subjective and objective validity, of the valid being of certain capacities within us and of certain things exterior to us, are produced by nature and the Bible in the same way, viz: by representations to the mind; the one is ordinary, the other extraordinary, but they are not opposed to each other; they do not differ in kind, but only in degree of effect. The latter is only in addition to the former; and, from moral hinderances oftener fails to arouse the attention of the mind; and from the greatness of the objects which it represents, oftener fails to produce adequate phenomena in the consciousness. But the modes of representation are similar and the resulting conviction of the reality of their respective objects, is as certain in the one case as in the other, whenever moral hinderances are absent and the attention is gained. What is the external world? It does not come into consciousness; a perceptive is not intuitive with the thing perceived, a thought with the object of thought, nor an idea with the process of which it is the exposition. All we know of the external world, is, that it is something which has power to affect the mind in such a way as to lead to mental operations which result in certain appearances in consciousness, and the conviction of the reality of the mind perceiving, thinking or comprehending, and of things so perceived, thought or com-

prehended. It is something which can reach, impress and arouse our mental faculties. What is the inner world? It does not come into consciousness; all which we know of it is, that it is the source of the operations which in connection with the contact given from without, produce phenomena in consciousness, while it does not itself appear. What is the spiritual world? It does not come into consciousness; and all that we know of it is, that it is something which by means of the Bible makes certain representations to our minds, which result in the phenomena of the Christian consciousness, and the belief of the reality of their objects. The Bible is God's work and God's instrumentality as fully as the material world. Like nature it is a symbol of invisible things. It is not science nor is it poetry, but a symbol of spiritual things, a representation of spiritual realities. If there be science and poetry in the Bible, it is only in the same sense that there are science and poetry in nature. Like nature it is only the occasion of science and poetry. Its language, in the strict sense is neither literal nor figurative; neither addressed in any of its forms of expression to the understanding alone, nor to the imagination alone, but to the soul, by at once impressing all the faculties and susceptibilities of the mind. Its forms of literal words or figures of speech are employed not simply to express and adorn truth; but to arouse the mind to spiritual action, to bring the soul in contact with spiritual realities. It is an instrumentality, in which God employs human words and human actions, the forms and laws of nature and of humanity, the history of a chosen people, and extraordinary institutions and ceremonies which he instituted among them; the history of a life, in which could be seen the real perfections of Deity and of the true perfections of humanity; the description of a death, in which could be seen the fullest illustration of Divine wisdom and justice and love; and the exhibition of salvation by words and significant institutions as to produce in the mind a consciousness of spiritual realities, which could not, or would not have been produced, by the ordinary mode of representation or by the material world alone. We are made in the image of God; here we have capacities for the spiritual, the supernatural world. These capacities are reached by the representations of the Bible, and the result is the cognition of spiritual objects, and the belief of the reality of them. The method is fundamentally the same, with that of the material world; both presuppose appropriate faculties, and

both consist in making suggestions to the mind and arousing it to action.

Again, the belief of the natural, and of the Christian consciousness, rests on the same grounds. How do we become assured that appearances in natural consciousness are not deceptive? Not by comparing the phenomenon with the object, for that would be impossible; and if it were possible, it would be absurd, because if we could get the object itself to be compared, there would be no longer any need of the comparison. The notion that we are more sure that we know material things better than we do spiritual, because they are so tangible or near to us, is a delusion. There are no more in consciousness and no nearer to us than spiritual objects. All we can do or ever attempt, is to examine whether we may not have mistaken the action of one faculty for that of another; or to appeal to the consciousness of another name, and this can be done with as much facility, in the one case as in the other. If I suspect that I have mistaken a more seeming for a real preception, I can examine whether my preceptive capacity was affected by an operation of the fancy or by that of a real distinguishing faculty. And so if I suspect that I have mistaken a superstitious notion for a real religious idea, I can examine whether my religious susceptibility was affected through reason and conscience, or by means of the imagination. Or if, in a case of natural consciousness, I can appeal to the common consciousness of all those who have had similar experience; I can also in a case of Christian consciousness appeal to thousands of Christians. We admit that as there are moral hinderances in the way of the development of Christian consciousness, it is not as common even in Christian countries and in Christian professors as the natural consciousness; but the appeal to it, as a criterion, can be made with sufficient facility on all questions involving the great fundamental Christian phenomena. I find in a German Periodical an extract from a late work of Dr. Kahnis, which is in point here. "If Christianity be, in its nature, a saving communion with God through Jesus Christ, then does its claim rest not only upon the truth of its idea; but also on the consciousness of individuals who are reconciled to God. Every true Christian is a child of God; who knows himself to be in a communion of reconciliation, of a new life, of a striving after perfection, which rests not upon feelings which come and go, but upon Divine powers and realities. The Christian knows what he is from

himself, and what he has become through God, and is secured, by the never ending conflict between these two powers, against the danger of an apotheosis of the living powers of his own human nature. It is true, that an unbelieving criticism has always answered to this, that every man finds his satisfaction, within the bounds of his religion. It can only be said, at last, the Christian *believes* himself to be in communion with God. Whether this communion holds also on the part of God, is another question. In truth, to outsiders, there can no proof be given than, "Come and see!" The Apostolic age had the evidence of the spirit and of power. Instead of this, we know the world of effects which Christianity has produced in eighteen hundred years. For many hundreds of years, thousands upon thousands of all races, ranks, nations, idiosyncracies, and degress of culture have, in good and in evil days, borne testimony to the peace of God which passeth all understanding. The man, who occupies a general religious standpoint, will find much, in the religious books of the Hindoos, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Mohamedans, which is true and refreshing; out of them, as they are, he will not be edified. But in Genesis, there flows a fountain of primitive life, which precisely, in this madly excited, artificial, perishing time, is a real life-battle to all who have any remaining longing for the Divine origin of humanity. In the Psalms, the pious of all ages have found the most profound expressions of their inner experience. Not only to all Christians, but to all men, in whom there is any remaining notion of the image of God in us, the words of Christ in the Gospels would seem to say, "Take off thy shoes for the ground whereon thou standest is holy." What streams of living water have the Gospels and Epistles which, during so many hundreds of years, have been read and expounded in the Christian congregations, like "the rod of God," struck out of the rock of the human heart! There breathes in the sermons, liturgies and hymns of every century, one and the same spirit. Whatever was edifying, said by Augustine in the ancient Church, by Bernard in the Middle Age, by Luther in the Reformation period, still quickens us, like the song of the birds which, in early Spring, come from the more genial South. Out of the features of the personalities of every century, there looks out upon us a common spirit, a family spirit of which Jesus Christ is the arche-type. Against this world of witnesses must those oppose themselves, who would declare the life-experience of the individual

Christian to be an illusion. But he who, from that which he has experienced, calls Christ his life, needs no proof of the truth of the life of Jesus. The Christ in us, is security for the Christ before us, for us, over us. This living, saving communion of man with God through Christ, in the Holy Spirit, is the wonderful ring, in which the nature and truth of Christianity lie. Not upon the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, not upon dogmatic ideas, not upon the mediation of science; but upon the life-part of his real communion with God through Christ, the true Christian bases his Christianity. And as it is thus the immovable ground of the truth of Christianity, it is evident that the nature of Christianity lies in it.

The beliefs of the natural and of the Christian consciousness bear the same relation to all speculative arguments against the validity of their objects. Objections, in both instances, are derived from the same source and are overborne in the same practical way. The reader will have learned from the history of Philosophy, with what appearance of demonstration the reality of both the outer qualities and the inner operations, both the subjective and the objective, in our perceptions, has been denied. The materialist taking his position upon the fact, that the impression upon the organs of sense is material, as far as it can be traced, draws the conclusion, that it continues to be such, in the completed perception, and consequently, that there is no mental operation in mind. The Berklean, taking his position upon the fact that all sensation is in the mind, declares that, "the existence of a body out of a mind, perceiving it, is not only impossible, and a contradiction in terms, but were it possible and even real, it were impossible that the mind should ever know it." The Fichtean, assuming the *ego* or the *I*, as that which we know certainly, demonstrates that what appears to be external to the mind, or the not I, is only the mind objectifying the limits of its own operations, and thus leads us to the system of Egotistic idealism. The Hegelian, beginning with thought as the known, shows that what appears to be exterior to thought is only the reflection of its own processes according to inherent convictions of its evolution, and thus ends in absolute idealism. But whenever, the practical principles of our nature are called into action, the mind raises an unceasing protest against these conclusions, and causes us to believe in the reality of an inner and an outer world;

these things are felt to be practically real and true, even if they were speculatively proved to be false and deceptive. And so the consistent disciple of the sensational school of philosophy, in following out the doctrine, that there is nothing in the intellect, which was not first in the sense, and finding that power was not an object of perception, that substance and cause cannot be obtained from any analysis of the contents of the sense, denies the validity of substance and cause, declares that the notion of any efficiency in what is called the cause to produce its consequent as the effect, is a delusion, that the external world consists solely of phenomena, with juxta-position in space and succession in time, but without any inherence in substance, or adherence to cause, that mind is only a coacervation and succession of ideas, with no connection, no common ground or constant source. But no matter how legitimate might appear the argument which led us to this conclusion, we could never be satisfied with our philosophy, for the practical principles of our nature would so constantly and irresistibly give phenomena, from within and from without, to be connected in thought, and the notion of substance and cause would so inevitably be employed, as the only possible regulative of all our thinking, that we would be obliged practically to treat them as real, and we would, in general, have no satisfactory thinking, no rest in our thoughts, until we admitted their valid being. Even when unconscious of its own laws the mind cannot ignore them, and consequently whenever any practical interest is involved, it will receive the testimony of consciousness, and accept results, the rational ground of which, it cannot or does not see, and which may seem to be ignored by speculative reasoning.

The necessitarian, taking his stand upon the conditional connections of the understanding, brings out, in clear demonstration, the conclusion that all things are bound in the chains of either a material or an intellectual necessity, and that consequently, all ideas of freedom and responsibility of right and obligation, all distinctions of holiness and sin, of virtue and vice, are a delusion; and that all the phenomena of moral feeling and action are the mere result of habit and education. But the practical laws of our being are too strong for our speculative powers. When practical interests are involved, men have no resting place for their thinking, no satisfactory conclusions, until they admit moral intuitions, assume, as unquestionable principles, the light of conscience

and the ultimate rule of right. No matter how much false reasoning may do to ignore, and sinful desires to suppress, these moral impulses, yet will men be obliged particularly to recognize their freedom and responsibility. However much conscience may be suppressed, men are practically obliged to feel, that it is the ruling principle of their being, that it is the rightful governer of it, that it ought to reign, and that, at last, all other things will be subjected to it, in the way of either reward or punishment.

The same thing holds in regard to the facts of spiritual being; God, the soul, and immortality. The Atheist, following out a little further the demonstration of the materialist, comes to the conclusion, that there is nothing supernatural, no God. The Pantheist, following in the footsteps of the logical understanding, finds neither end nor beginning of the process, and according as he follows the ideal or the phenomenal process, fixes his attention upon the inner or the outer world, he ends in a material or ideal pantheism. Thus he denies all personality to the Deity, and explains the phenomena of religion as the results of human ignorance, as superstitious ideas, the results of the blind imagination or the stupid fears of ignorant men. But the facts of religion lie so near to the practical principles of our nature, they so constantly press themselves upon the consciousness that men cannot, generally, or for a long time, be atheists. Nor can the mind be practically satisfied with that idealism which, while it admits that the religious ideas are not the result of ignorance, but of the conditional evolution of thought, the production not of an unenlightened imagination, nor of ignorant fears, but of the necessities of thought, and of the highest laws and of the fullest development of thinking, notwithstanding, regards them as purely subjective, as only the regulatives of thought, the necessary order of our thoughts, without any objective reality corresponding to them. Amid their spiritual wants and the ever-recurring life questions, in the course of their inner and outer life, men can, practically, no more be satisfied with an ideal, than with a material pantheism. Having the faculty of design themselves, they will recognize design in the world around them, being persons themselves, they will believe the Deity to be a person. They can neither *deify the soul nor deny its existence.* No mind in the circumstances of humanity, can be always without belief in the reality of God, the soul and immortality, and yet be satisfied in life and happy in death.

In like manner the phenomena of Christian consciousness have been called in question. Rationalism admits the objective validity of the religious ideas, which have just been mentioned, but regards them as sufficient, and as it considers them to be the production of unaided reason, concludes that reason is a sufficient guide in our religious life. Rationalists endeavor to satisfy themselves with what they deem the dictates of unassisted reason, and forgetting their indebtedness to the Bible for the very education, by which the ideas of the reason were developed, for the very influence, under which they have been enabled to prove the being of God, of the soul, and of immortality, to cognize the evidences of these great truths and to build their system of rationalism, imagine themselves independendent of it, and reject the great scheme of redemption and salvation which it reveals. But men can only regard the truths thus demonstrated (and as the rationalists supposes discovered) by reason, as sufficient, while they live in the sphere of intellectual speculation. When they come in contact with the facts of real life, give their attention to our character, condition and work in this world sufficiently to come under the influence of the practical principles of their nature, they will find that other truths are demanded, for the satisfaction of their rational, moral and sentient capacities. When personal and practical interests raise the questions, what is my moral character and condition, and what relation do I bear to God and his government? Whence am I, and what will be my destiny in eternity? What is the meaning of this world of sin, and what is the great end of life, and how can it be attained? These questions reason can never satisfactorily answer. It is only by the plan of salvation, revealed in the Bible, that a spiritual world, into which sin has entered, can be comprehended in its beginning and end. And especially when men are brought to deal practically with the reality and consequences of sin, in their own persons, facts which rationalism itself admits, and which the practical principles of our nature will, in no case, entirely fail to force upon the consciousness; when they are made to ask, for some solid ground for the hope of the forgiveness of sin, the justification of a sinner, how the soul once "alienated from the life of God in the soul" can be regenerated and restored to holy communion with God, by what power the fetters of sinful habit can be broken, and in what form or way, the infinitely holy God can present himself to the creature, which hates holiness, so as to be an ob-

ject attractive enough, to win the confidence and love of the heart to raise it above the objects of grovelling appetites and passions, and to fill it with holy and enduring joys; when they are brought to realize their frailty in life and their helplessness in death, they will feel that there is more comfort in a single sentence of the Bible, in a solitary promise of the Gospel than in all the speculations of a rationalistic, or the dreams of a mystic, philosophy. Thus it is, that men attain to a true rationalism and a real transcendentalism, to a practical, as well as a rational philosophy which decides, that the truths, revealed in the Bible, are so suited, to the capacities and wants of the spirit in its present condition, that they cannot but be as reliable and as real as the light which we see, and the air which we breathe. It was because, these principles were in lively exercise in the mind of Socrates, that he became almost a Christian without revelation, or at least, became somewhat conscious of the necessity of some such interposition; and that which makes infidels, in spite of the Bible, we may well suppose, is not a complete analysis of the condition and wants of man, nor a perfect apprehension of his powers and destination. It must result, from a want of due attention to the means by which, truth is impressed upon the mind; and hence it is only necessary that practical principles should present their demands, in such a way, that it must be attended to, and the necessity of revelation will be found to lie in the very nature and condition of our moral and spiritual being. Nature and reason demand personal acquaintance with God and communion with him, as the necessary conditions of spiritual satisfaction. If God and the soul be realities; then, in the original and normal state of man, the knowledge of God and communion with him, would be natural and uninterrupted, knowing him as intuitive, as the beholding of the sun, and communion with him as natural, as the breathing of the surrounding atmosphere. As man does not now sustain this relation; a revelation of the person and will of God, such a scheme of redemption, such a method of restoration as the Bible proposes to give, must be very desirable. Only, by such a revelation can we have full and satisfactory knowledge of his origin and destiny, of the ground of his duty and his hope, and of the source of his strength and happiness. Beautifully and truthfully it has been said: "Were our hearts right with God, miraculous interpositions would be unnecessary, every creature, every event should promote our acquaintance with

our Maker. And such is the condescension of the Most High, that he vouchsafes to cure our ignorance, inattention or unbelief, by making the mighty sacrifice of that stated order of things, which his wisdom settled at first, and which his power continues to impart. Rather than man shall remain unchanged, unredeemed, the great system of nature shall undergo alteration; fire shall cease to burn, the Nile shall run blood instead of water, the sun shall forget to shine for days together, the eternal, uncreated word shall become man, and the fountain of life to all shall expire in death."

The same thing holds in regard to the external evidences of Christianity. The sacred writers are so manifestly reliable witnesses to the truth of the facts, to which they bear testimony, that we question whether any reader, who is guided merely by common sense, and judges of them as he does in other questions relating to matters of fact, ever doubted of their sincerity or competency. And the same test applied to any theories, which give a satisfactory exposition of the introduction of Christianity, and of the historical records of it, on any other supposition, whether they be the gross theories of the French and English infidels or the subtile hypotheses of the later German rationalists, will make a practical thinker feel that they must be rejected; that we must receive the testimony of the sacred writers or ignore all the laws of mind. For to deny it would bring us in conflict with those practical principles, by which we do always practically believe testimony of such a character; and to ignore one law of mind is to ignore all. If we doubt that consciousness, which is the light of all our seeing, on one point, we must doubt it on all, and become universal sceptics, and this we can never practically be. That this is the case is manifest from the fact, that the last resort of scepticism in its efforts to destroy confidence in the validity of testimony, is to an *a priori* philosophy making some speculative principle determinative of the facts of history, conferring upon philosophy the right to ignore all facts of history, sacred as well as profane, whose exposition cannot be made consistently with the philosopher's assumed necessary law of mental development; thus adopting a principle which common sense universally rejects, and at the same time tacitly granting, that if the facts of Christianity be historically true, they are supernatural, surperhuman, miraculous, and that all former efforts of rationalism to explain the New Testa-

ment, consistently with the denial of its miraculous origin and superhuman facts, has failed; and that if the New Testament be authentic, then the doctrines of orthodox and evangelical Christianity are true.

The very latest writers of this character, plant themselves upon the assumption, that miracles are so highly improbable, that they cannot be believed on any account of testimony. I quote from an article of a friend of the School, translated for the Bibliotheca Sacra: "The chief element of such independence, Strauss considered to be disbelief in miracles. He asserted that our frequent experience of the imperfection of human observation, of the falsity of tradition, of the untrustworthiness of narratives, through designed or undesigned invention, render it much less probable, that a miracle occured than that the historian has to deal in the Gospel with a fictitious narrative." When charged by his opponents with putting Christianity in a position, in which its supernatural and miraculous elements shall disappear, he (Baur) replies: "Such must necessarily be the tendency of all historical inquiry. Its office is to investigate events in connection with their causes and results. A miracle, however, destroys this natural connection. It assumes a position in which, not from the want of adequate information, but from the very necessity of the case, it is impossible to consider one thing as the natural consequence of another."

Now it is perfectly in accordance with the convictions of mankind generally, that there should be miraculous interpositions. It was not common sense, but speculative philosophy, which originated the doubt of the competency of human testimony, for the proof of miracles. And only a single step is necessary, to show that the speculative process, by which this denial is brought about, comes in conflict with common consciousness. Creation is a miracle; for a miracle is an event which is contrary to the uniform course of things; a case in which "it is impossible to consider one thing as the natural consequence of another," consequently as the creation of the world was an event, contrary to what was uniformly before, contrary to what was the natural or ordinary state of being, it was a miracle. To deny the credibility of a miracle then, is to deny the creation of the world; and to deny creation is to deny, that the Deity is a person, for, if there be no creation, then we must accept atheism or pantheism, as the true philosophy of the universe. But if the Deity be not a person, then we are not persons; but to deny

our personality would involve the denial of all the phenomena of moral consciousness, the sense of responsibility, freedom, etc.

But we have already seen, that such is the force of the practical principles of our nature, that we must practically believe in the reality of the objects of moral phenomena against all speculative processes ; or we will have no satisfactory thought, feeling or action. The denial, therefore, of even the external or historical evidences of Christianity, brings us into conflict with the practical principles of our nature. Thus have we seen that the objections to the beliefs in natural consciousness, and to those in the Christian consciousness, come from the same source, and are met, in both cases, by the same protest of the mind, under the influence of practical principles. This is not always done in so high a degree in the latter, as in the former, because Revelation, on account of our moral blindness, perversity and callousness, is met by peculiar hinderances, but where these are overcome or removed, and the attention is gained, the result invariably follows. It does lay hold upon the practical principles of our nature, and faith in the reality of its objects is produced, in some minds immediately, as, in the case of little children, of whom emphatically "is the kingdom of Heaven;" in some by a later conversion ; and when men do not receive it, all true satisfaction is destroyed, and real misery is produced, whenever they are brought to think of the great interests of the spirit, which must sooner or later, be the case. Hume confesses, that philosophical scepticism had this effect upon him. He says: "The intense view of these manifold contradictions and imperfections of human nature have so wrought upon me, and heated my brain, that I am ready to reject all belief and reasoning, and can look upon no opinion even as more probable or likely than another; and I wish I had never been born." When we trace the history of religious scepticism, and see how one generation of sceptics have reared systems, only to be demolished by their successors, and how the works of these in turn have vanished, "like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a trace behind," when we have seen their uneasiness, and the eagerness, with which they have seized upon every new fact, discovered in science, to turn it, if possible, against Christianity, we cannot but believe that there is here no alternative, but faith or misery. Happy the sceptic, whose mental dissatisfaction, at last, leads him to receive the love of the truth. All the advantages,

indeed, on such a subject, which the speculative thinker, who, at last, recognizes the controlling claims of these principles, has over the practical man, who has not stopped to question the facts of which the mind is made cognizant in this way, but who has always acted upon them ; all that compensates for the loss of time and of spiritual blessings, is some experience, experience always valuable, if made in due time, though it be bitter and dearly bought, happy experience of escape from dangers, by which thousands have perished ! For of the multitudes, who seek for some other solution of these facts, who seek for speculative principles, where none but moral or probable evidence is possible ; who set out with the determination of receiving these facts, only when they are seen to rest upon a scientific basis, to ignore, if they cannot demonstrate them, few return without harm from the pursuit. In this case, it is emphatically true, "that experience is like the stern-light of a ship which illuminates only its wakes." Blessed is the man who, without question or delay yields to practical truth in this case, for here speculation can, at best, end only in bitter experience and repentance, and is, most likely, to result in spiritual blindness and death !

It adds greatly to the strength of our position, to notice, that, as men attend more to the observation of facts, in the progress of knowledge, science and revelation are brought more and more into harmony. Butler's analogy of religion is a specimen of what may be done, by an observation of things as they really are, to show that there is an analogy between the course of nature and the scheme of revelation, and to expose the futility of all *a priori* assumptions against the Bible, A wider induction and a deeper analysis of psychological facts are gradually bringing philosophy to find its end, just where religion begins. Formerly men could only appeal to common sense, against the conclusions of speculative reasonings which were in conflict with the beliefs in consciousness ; now some progress has been made in demonstrating the unsoundness of the process itself. Animal history in the hands of an Agassiz, is turned from the support of Pantheism to the support of Theism. Geology, in the hands of Hugh Miller, is found not only to agree with the Mosaic account of creation, but to prove the fact of creation ; and by proving one miracle, to refute forever the argument drawn from the supposed antecedent improbability of mira-

cles. One miracle proved, that of original creation or that of the superinduction of a new force or forces afterwards, for instance, and all miracles become credible ; facts which can be safely received on the ground of testimony. And what can be believed from the testimony of the rocks, may certainly be received as credible on the word of such men as John and Paul and the early Christians generally.

It has led also to a more complete discovery of the analogy between nature and revelation, of the general similarity, in Providence, in nature and in grace. It has demolished many of the positions assumed by the opponents of Christianity by pointing out many analogies between the theology of nature and the theology of revelation. If men had hastily concluded against the system of grace, that its progress was slow and parcelled out into different dispensations ; this science by bringing to light the long pre-Adamic ages of our earth, the different and distinct organizations of those periods, the convulsions that have rent the earth and destroyed successively the races of animals to make room for higher and more perfect organizations, has shown, that God operates in nature by slow steps and gradual processes, precisely as the Bible represents him as having done in revelation and in the diffusion of the plan of salvation, and that the prophetic change of our world which is to result, in "new heavens and a new earth, in which shall dwell righteousness," has its types in the first revolutions on the surface of the earth. It joins the Bible, in regarding all the changes of nature, as a preparative for the creation of man ; and in looking upon all the movements of Providence, as a provision for the coming of the new man, upon all the changes in the earth as so many prophetic types of the dispensations of grace, and upon all the events of nature as only so many means for the promotion of moral ends, as so many preparations for the final reign of grace all over the world.

If men had objected to the moral probability of revelation and miracles, if they could not deem it consistent with the wisdom of God to adopt such a vast and extensive scheme of salvation for such creatures as men, if the exhibitions of the worlds in space made it seem a thing incredible, that God should send his Son to die, for so insignificant a portion of the great family of rational beings, as the inference drawn from the assumption, that the immense and countless worlds in space were the abodes of high intelligences, would make

it to be; then the history of our world in time has answered the objection. It proves, that in the Divine plan a world may be, and that our earth actually was, the abode only of animals of the lower orders, for long ages, before it was prepared and fitted to be the abode of rational beings. It shows that there was no ground for the conclusion, that those numerous worlds in space must already be the homes of rational beings, but that they may be only in a state of slow and gradual preparation for the reception of intelligent inhabitants. It shows, that we may be only in that period of time, which is the infancy of moral being in the universe, that the history of moral worlds may be first begun; that this may be the seed time of the moral universe, and that as such creative periods are generally determinative of all time to come, it is worthy of God, to expend the treasures of his wisdom and power and love upon it. Our earth may not only be the laboratory of truth for the universe, but the very nursery of the intelligent and moral but future occupants of those "many mansions of our heavenly Father's house." It is probable, that, with the exception of the angels spoken of in the Bible, men may be the only rational creatures in the universe, or at least, the only family of rational beings, where creatures are born and die, where one generation goeth and another cometh, and where all individuals and generations are so connected, that what is done for one is done for all, and who consequently can be most properly the subjects, in whose redemption from sin and death might be made manifest to principalities and powers, in heavenly places, now existing, or yet to be brought into being, the manifold wisdom of God, and the history of whose justification and sanctification, social and final happiness on earth, and individual eternal happiness in heaven might be afforded a display of God's moral character, and of the beauty and necessity of holiness in the creature, sufficient to confirm and establish all innocent beings in perpetual obedience and blessedness. It may be, that humanity has been taken into union with the Deity, in the person of the Godman, in order that her children might be prepared, by the processes of redemption, in due time, to take secure and happy possession of the different portions of the physical empire of Jehovah, so fast as they shall have been prepared for rational beings in any part of the immensity of space. Or at least, it may be that, in accordance with their higher destiny, as the members and spouse of Christ, as the sharers of his image, his glories,

and his throne, they may not only be saved by the plan of salvation themselves, but be here qualified to be kings and priests unto God throughout the universe, to be the instructors and governors of its more youthful and less experienced population, and in every place show forth his praises, when he shall have come to "be glorified in his saints and admired in all them that believe." Thus will the music of the spheres be found, at last, to be in perfect harmony with "the song of Moses and of the Lamb."

In a similar manner does the observation of moral phenomena in the history of man, both as an individual and as a society, confirm this truth. Wherever there is observed an intellect alive to the great questions of existence and destiny and yet satisfied, it is found to have derived its satisfaction from "the truth as it is in Jesus." Wherever there is a conscience awake to the reality of law and of sin and yet full of peace, it is seen to have found that peace in the wounds of a crucified Saviour. Wherever there is a will that has broken the chains of spiritual bondage and rejoices in the power to obey the right, it is found to have the liberty "wherewith the Son of God makes free." Wherever there is a heart, sensible of the emptiness of all earthly enjoyments, and yet satisfied, it is found to have quenched its thirst with that water "of which if a man drink he shall never thirst, but which shall be in him a well of water, springing up unto eternal life." Wherever there is a soul, which has sighed and groaned, amid the scenes of earthly frailty and mortality, and yet rejoices in the hope of another and a better world, it is found to believe in Him who could say, "I am the resurrection and life; he that believeth in me though he were dead yet shall he live."

And, in proportion, as men look at the social history of mankind, and observe, how the Bible has gone, hand in hand with all intellectual and moral progress; how the existence of nation after nation, has afforded series of experiments, all resulting in the exhibition of the truth, that there is a world of moral evils for which Christianity is the only remedy; how the present moral condition of every part of the earth corresponds precisely with the presence or absence of this source of all spiritual good; how the different degrees of intellectual power and moral excellence, to which the nations have respectively attained, is exactly commensurate with the prevalence of Christianity, in any part of the world; that where knowledge and purity prevail at all, there

the Gospel has been, and that where the nations have made the highest attainment in these respects, there it has had the freest "course to run and be glorified," they will feel that "God in Christ" must sustain a relation to the moral system, similar to that of the sun in in the planetary world.

How wonderful have been its progress and achievements in the world! A holy cause in a world of depravity, a power to whose claims are opposed all the natural inclinations and prevalent desires and habits of a sinful race, keeps its place among them, makes its home in the palace and in the cottage, in the halls of the learned and in the hovels of the ignorant, dwells with the high and the powerful and with the humble and the lowly; in the shop of the artizan upon the land and in the ship of the merchant upon the sea; amid the arts of peace and the turmoils of war; sometimes wearing the martyr's crown and sometimes wielding the monarch's sceptre, producing peace to all penitents who yield to the claims of the holiness which it preaches, and at the same time, so arousing the energies of men, that a conflict of principles begins in human society, and wars and rumors of wars are occasioned. Its "life is hid with Christ in God," and yet it connects itself with all the powers and activities of men, takes hold of all their energies, and lays all their science and art under contribution for its exhibition and diffusion. It begs its way through the world, beseeching men in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God, and yet controls all the movements of society. It does "not lift up its voice in the streets;" but accommodates itself to all the conditions and developments of men. It walks in the path of the world's great movements, and pitches its tent in the out-posts of society. It connects itself with nations of the highest civilization, infuses life into dead forms and uses the beauties of literature and art to point the way to "the chief among ten thousands and the one altogether lovely," and, at the same time, it is found in the deep forests of the earth, and in the lonely islands of the sea, producing refinement in the rude hut of the barbarian and using the very wretchedness of temporal and spiritual poverty to lead men to the inexhaustible fountain of life and peace. And thus when one nation perishes, it is found to have secured a home in the abodes of its successor. Nations die, but Christianity lives and goes on "from conquering to conquer."

When we look at these facts we feel that Christianity has indeed a strong hold upon the practical principles of our na-

ture, and that is imperishable. Other things may change, "old things may pass away and all things become new," but Christianity, in all its relations to the temporal amelioration and the eternal salvation of man, remains the same, "yesterday, to-day, and forever." To this sea of life, with the alteration of one word we may apply the poet's apostrophe to the natural ocean:

> "Time writes no wrinkle on thine azure brow,
> Such as redemption's dawn beheld, thou rollest now."

Imperishable as the starry firmament over our heads, is the everlasting Gospel in its requirements and its effects. Nay the most permanent thing in nature can only be used as an illustration of the immutability of the plan of salvation, in the way of contrast. "Lift up thine eye, saith Jehovah to the heavens and look upon the earth beneath; the heavens shall vanish like smoke; the earth shall perish and all that dwell therein shall die, but my salvation is forever, my righteousness shall not be abolished."

And when we behold, how Divine Providence has in all ages overruled all the great movements of society; for its diffusion and prevalence, we are confident that its dominion will, at last, be universal. All the nations have been made wittingly or unwittingly to subserve this great purpose. Century after century has passed since the mustard seed of the Gospel was planted, and though apparently the least of all seeds, it has become a great tree. Political storms have swept away the nations, principalities and powers have been swallowed by the billows of time, but triumphant over the storm and the wave has stood this heavenly tree; and thus it will stand a tree of life with "leaves for the healing of the nations," and branches, which shall spread until they have reached the ends of earth, and sheltered the whole family of man, amid the noon-day of Millennial Glory. At every footstep in the movements of his Providence, God seems to say: "Behold I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion, I will declare the decree, Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth, for thy possession."

# ARTICLE IV.

## THE RACES OF MEN IN FRENCH HISTORY.

By Henry Coppee, A. M., Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

In considering the races of men in French History, we have reached a subject which presents one of the most curious and difficult problems in European Ethnology. We have stated in a former article, that when two races of men come together the stronger race, by an invariable Ethnic law, will destroy the weaker; such was the case as we have seen with the Kelts in Britain when the Saxons came upon them, and such the fate of the American Indian in his contact with white civilization. To this general remark it may be added that almost always, when two races thus come together, one will soon demonstrate itself to be radically stronger than the other, and drive the weaker away before its triumphant march. How much then are we astonished to find so different a result in France! to find two races, for fourteen centuries, living side by side, in the same territory, or rather the one master, the other slave, and yet neither impaired by the conflict or giving way before the collisions of a constant enmity. Such, in simple language, is the curious and difficult problem in French History.

That first classic wave, to which you will remember we only reason back by analogy, there being no record of its coming, was of the Keltic variety and Phœnician in its elements, and seemed to pass from headland to headland in the Mediterranean; giving what human science would call aborigines or indigenous races to Greece, Italy, Gaul and Spain and what the Greeks in their presumption called autochthones, and to indicate which, they wore in their hair the golden grasshopper. By the time that Julius Cæsar had conquered Gaul, it was discovered that this race had been divided into many different tribes, and Gaul itself was divided by him into three parts, inhabited by Belgians, Kelts and Aquitanians. It is no part of our purpose to dwell upon these distinctions, but rather, taking the Gauls all to be Kelts, to treat the race as one. It was the Keltic race; it was reinforced by continual accessions from the East, of the same

blood, and it assumed new characteristics from its new residence. The Gauls differed widely from the German race, being of smaller size, darker complexion, and oposite physical features ; they were of great personal bravery, as is shown by their wonderful deeds as they journeyed to France. They had taken Delphi, the seat of the Oracles ; they had crossed the Alps before Hannibal, and sacked Rome four centuries before Christ, when Rome was a collection of wooden and earthen huts ; the Senonian Gauls had founded Milan, and settled themselves in that beautiful valley of the Po, to which the Romans gave the name of Cis-Alpine or Hither Gaul.

They were of an impetuous and generous spirit, but had a great nobility of character. They lacked constancy, and above all displayed a decided repugnance to the ideas of discipline and order, which marked the German tribes, even in their wildest adventures.

If as asserted by Amedee Thierry, the Historian of the Gauls, nineteen-twentieths of the French of to-day are the decendants of these Gauls, we may expect to find their traits reproduced now, and to learn much of the philosophy of French History, by forming an intimate acquaintance with the Gauls. We shall find some strange reproductions in modern times of Gaulish character and Gaulish vitality.

It was upon such a race, domiciled in Gaul, that the Romans exerted their ubiquitous influence. Remaining in a wild and semi-barbarous state ; shut off from their brethren the Keltiberians of Spain by the Pyrenees ; from Rome by the Alps, whose mountain passes were half the year piled with snow, and defended from human escalade by sentinel avalanches, poised upon a whisper, and started by foot-fall ; marked off from the Northern nations by the Rhine, they might have remained in peaceful Gaulish barbarism, or, perhaps, aided by their beautiful geography, whose splendid river-arteries send tribute, and bring tide from three oceans, they might have achieved a civilization equal to any, which paganism had produced, but the Romans, the ever-present Romans were about to make through them their strongest impression on modern civilization. There is a story, that as the Britons asked the Saxon aid against the Picts and Scots, so at this early time, the Gauls had been annoyed by the Helvetic, their Swiss neighbors, and had begged for Roman assistance. But no such statistics are needed. The Romans came as

they went every where and, unlike the result, in Britain; the Romans transmuted everything they touched.

The Gauls were an easy, because a willing conquest. Fighting at first against the very name of invasion as was natural, they bowed without a murmur to the magnificence of Roman civilization; they opened their eyes with admiration at the splendor of Roman arms, they drank in eagerly instruction in those beautiful Roman letters which they have called, in their Creole tongue, Belles Lettres; they fell deliciously into the abomination of Roman luxury, and forgetting their ancestry and their eastern achievements, fighting against each other and thus for Rome, the conclusion was soon established; they became Roman in form, Roman in name, and decidedly of great importance to the great West of the Roman provinces. They had received from Rome its paganism; in turn they received its Christianity, and were content with both as the product of the great creator and protector, Rome. The time of the Roman occupancy was not much longer than that of their residence in Britain, about five hundred years, and yet how different was the result!

The Britains had learned nothing, had forgotten nothing, had gone on from generation to generation, the slaves of Roman masters; hewers of wood and drawers of water. The Gauls, on the contrary became perfectly Romanized, they gave up their language, and learned the Latin; it was the custom of the best families of Gaul to look for and to receive preferment in the Roman army or the Roman senate. In that beautiful South of France on this side the Alps, watered by the arrowy Rhone, the Romans established Provincia, the Roman province by pre-eminence, which has only been slightly altered to make it the Provence of our day. To show how Roman every thing in Gaul had become, we need but look at the language and the antiquities which remain. At Nimes in the Province are more numerous and interesting monuments of Roman art than in any other city in Europe, Rome excepted. The maison carre, marks the Roman element in the South, as clearly as the splendid Druidic circles in Picardy and Brittany tell of Keltic predominance in the North. With all this there was comparatively small contamination of blood among the people; the Romanized Gauls were still Gauls in all their integrity, mastered by Roman influence, clothed with the Roman *toga* but ready now to lie supine when any other master should appear to assume that

rod, which Rome was just about to give up forever. The Western Empire was declining to its fall; all over eastern Europe was the sound of Gothic horns and the clash of Gothic steel, on their way to Rome; in the West, on the Rhine, the confederate Franks were singing loud battle songs and marching down upon Roman Gaul. It was yet Roman Gaul in name, although for a long time, as a Gaulish poet has truly said, they felt but the shadow of the Empire. *Portavimus umbram imperii.*

These were all German tribes of the great Scythian wave, coming down upon the Gauls of the Keltic wave, in their Westward march; but they were not now to meet with a certain and uninterrupted success. Of these German tribes, the Goths and Burgundians had first come down and overrun Gaul, the Burgundians with very just instinct making themselves masters of the Roman province on the Rhone; and the Goths settling in the low country about the Garonne, which was called Aquitania, accustomed to the easy fitting yoke of Rome. By these new conquerors the Gauls were mastered and kept down. But it was to be for a brief space, for Germans were to drive out Germans. And now the new invasion from the North threatens, and the Gauls are not sorry to see it come, only their new masters, the Burgundians and Goths dread it sorely. What more fruitful country than the banks of the Garonne, what more beautiful home than the Rhone, straight and swift as an arrow in its flight! But who are these new comers? and why are they to be dreaded, why not opposed? Between the Rhine and the Elbe had consolidated themselves many German tribes, under the generic name of Franks; those on the north-east on the river Saale, were called the Salian Franks; those on the Rhine the Ripuarian Franks or Franks of the river bank.

Like the Teuton type, they were large in person, fierce in temper, personally independent, shrinking from no danger nor hardship; barbarous national foot-pads on land, as the Saxons were pirates on the ocean. The motto, which they adopted, as indicating their character, was, Frank und frei, frank and free. Frank and free themselves, they were inclined to enslave all they met. To illustrate their wonderful energy and indomitable purpose, we know that all the prisoners of a Frankish tribe, taken by the Romans on one occasion, had been sent in exile as a colony to the Black Sea, but after being taken there they had marched to the Mediterranean, which they had never seen, had seized shipping forcibly, had

pillaged the coast and the Islands of the Mediterranean on their way homeward, and, passing the straits of Gibraltar, had made for their old camping grounds on the Rhine, to the astonishment of their fellows and the utter consternation of the Romans.

These were the men, who with that striking German individuality, now made their appearance under Chlodowig or Clovis with his Merowings, and rushed furiously upon the oppressed and the oppressors, the Gaulish nation, and the Gothic and Burgundian master. It was not a doubtful conflict, for to a considerable extent the Goths and Burgundians had adopted Roman manners, and become already softened by the luxuriousness of Roman habits.

To realize such a march we must look at them in detail; we must see not any thing analogous to Frenchmen of to-day elegant in costume, courteous, civic or military, alike in peace and war, progressive in science, original in art; we must see them with their long and tangled hair, the mark of honor, clothed in the skins of wild boars and bears and seals, their war chariots drawn by huge oxen; we must look upon that army which Chateaubriand has described, standing in the form of a triangle, in which could be distinguished nothing but a forest of javelins, of wild beast skins and half-naked bodies, and which, when it moved, moved with the swiftness and ravage of a thunder bolt.

Hark! to the clang of shield and spear as they move forward they join their voices in chorus: "Pharamond, Pharamond, we have fought with the sword; we have hurled the battle axe with two blades, sweat ran from the brow of the warriors and trickled down their arms. The eagles and birds with yellow feet uttered screams of joy, the crows swam in the blood of the dead; all ocean was but a wound. The virgins have long wept. Our fathers fell in battle, all the vultures moaned at it. Our father's satiated them with courage. Let us choose wives, where milk shall be blood, and shall fill with valour the hearts of our sons. Pharamond! the song of the Bard is ended, the hours of life are passing away; we will smile when we must die."

Thus as they marched sang forty thousand barbarians. The riders raised and lowered their white shields in cadence, and at each burden they struck their iron-clad chests with the iron of their javelins. Such a spirit, such a cry, such an advance was irresistible!

Before such a host, the tenants of France, new and old, were like chaff before the storm-wind. Clovis with his long-haired Merowings had reached the banks of the Loire, and now from that natural entrenchment they had sallied forth and swept down, overturning Goth and Burgundian, overrunning Auverne, the Avernia of the Latins, seizing its rich flocks, its silver and gold; until at length they were stopped like the ocean spray by the ridges of the Pyrenees; and then returning in triumph through the devastation to the strong natural entrenchment on the right bank of the Loire.

But it is time now to look at the position of the Gaulish race which was thus buffeted about like a foot-ball in Gaul.

John Bull is a name pleasantly given by the English themselves to the ideal representative of the English Nation, and thanks to Punch, Mr. Bull will long be thus known. So the French, when they would speak of themselves, have nick-named France, personified as Jacques Bonhomme. Now Bonhomme from good man, has grown into simple or foolish fellow, and so when French writers would satirize the follies of the great French people, they have dwelt particularly upon that Bonhomme which has allowed the French to be ruled despotically for so many centuries. The truth is, that, fond of novelty and finding a charm of society in each new comer, seeking always some unknown good, Jacques Bonhomme, who is strong enough and brave enough to fight, had yielded too readily to the demands of his conquerors. After the Roman power and influence had done its work, he was too much accustomed to servitude to dream of freedom; his masters came too rapidly and were too august for him to doubt their right. When Cæsar and the legions had passed the Alps into Provence, he had stared in wonderment, he had cried *Vivat imperator*, with the legions, to the hook-nosed fellows of Rome; he had suffered himself supinely to be called no longer Keltos, or Gallus, but Romanus, the Roman; he had opened his eyes wider, had stood speechless with wonder, and knelt with proper humiliation when Goth, Vandal and Burgundian, sweeping by him like a magic host, had settled in his fairest southern provinces; and now as he saw the hairy Franks coming down to be his masters and perhaps to destroy the old mastery, what could he do but stammer out in a most lachrymal countenance, *Vivat rex*, Long live the Frankodo Koning.

But this was a worse irruption for him than Roman or Goth; they made Jacques work; they divided his land and

agricultural furniture and then made him till the soil; they burdened him with taxes and titles, they called him *litus*, which they translated *vilanus noster;* but he said, "Why do ye call me thus, my name is Romanus, the Roman?" He was told that *litus* was the Latin form of the German let or lat, to permit, and that he was called *Litus*, because he was permitted to live by the kindness of his new masters, and that to be truly grateful for that permission must be the business of his life.

Such then was the condition of the Gaulish race, at the time of the coming of the Franks. Sweeping down from their entrenchments behind the Loire, they conquered as we have seen the Burgundians, and thus relieved the Gauls in Burgundy of one set of masters to give them another, they drove out the Septimanian Goths, who abandoned Aquitanie and joined their brethren the Wisigoths in Spain, and then leaving garrisons in the conquered country, recrossed the Loire to their firm kingdom of Neustria. Thus began that Merovingian power, which gradually and successively spread itself over France, and encircled, without absorbing, that little north-western corner to which the Britons had fled from Saxon oppression.

When the Franks had appeared upon the banks of the Loire, they were Pagans, having for a religious creed the cold, unenthusiastic, but philosophical German theology. On the other hand Goths and Burgundians, like most of the Germans, were Arian Christians, and were thus, in the eyes of the Gauls, heretics. The Gauls, having received their orthodox creed from Rome, now looked hopefully even to the pagan Franks; better pagans than heretics.

Providence has decreed that the conversion of one man should establish orthodox Christianity in France, as two centuries before, the conversion of one man had spread the Christian faith through the immense empire of Rome. That man was Clovis the leader of the Merovingians, by chance apparently he had married Clotilda the only orthodox princess of the Teutonic race, and woman's influence had won him from his gods, and given a Christian destiny to France. You remember the story. It was like the toss of a copper, if he should be successful in battle, he would become a Christian; he was successful and fulfilled his promise.

We cannot forbear, for a moment, to dwell on the rich historic picture. St. Remigius, the holy Bishop of Rheims, baptized and anointed with miraculous oil, brought by a dove

from Heaven, him who was to be the first most Christian majesty of France. A spectacle of Roman magnificence was prepared in the Cathedral Church; gold and silver glistened everywhere, diamonds in profusion sparkled on the robes of the saints before the astonished gaze of the barbarian king; the streaming light, heavy with fragrant incense, splendid coronation robes, lulling Christian music intoxicated the heart and senses, and he cried out to the artful bishop: "This then is the kingdom of Heaven you have promised me, is it not?" Such was the Christianity which Clovis had won on the hazard of a battle. Here then was a new bond between Gaul and Frank, the bond of a common creed, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. From the time that Clovis was declared a Roman Catholic, the conquest over the Gauls was almost bloodless, although none the less oppressive for the willingness of the Gauls.

But of the time-civilizing effect of Christianity in France we find as yet no germ even. We have seen that Clovis regarded its rewards as a sensual paradise; if we look at the influence of this Merovingian sway upon order and morals, we shall find it in a deplorable state of society and, a vile perversion of the system and doctrines of Christianity. Unlike the Saxons, the confederate Franks were polygamists, and were the originators of some of the monstrous socialistic doctrines of modern French communists; after their conversion, they found to their delight, as they said, full authority for many wives in the Old Testament and nothing whatever against polygamy in the New. In that very graphic picture of Augustine Thierry, *Recit des Temps Merovingiens*, we find full lengths of cruelty and vice among the Frankish kings, which almost equal the palmy days of Commodus, Caligula and Nero. In the year 561, Clother, himself the son of Clovis, set out against one of his rebellious sons; having made him prisoner with his wife and children, he simply burned them all, as a just punishment; and died soon after himself, the historian informs us, with a clear conscience. It was, but the issue of that horrid principle of war which lived from the time of antiquity to that of Grotius, and which took no heed of parental ties, that the vanquished becomes the absolute property of their victor. His four sons, succeeding to his kingdom, were constantly engaged in the most treacherous and cruel wars against each other, violating treaties and oaths, sworn upon the relics of the holiest martyrs; stealing, lying, killing, committing

adultery, in short breaking every law of the decalogue with a religious impunity.

The saint of this family, Gonthraum lost his hunting horn, and wantonly put a number of freed men to the torture, until it should be found to humiliate others in the search, although they had nothing to do with its loss. There are few stories, more interesting or better as illustrations than the stories of the marriages of Hilperik, king of Neustria and Sighebert king of Austrasia with the daughters of Athanagild king of the Spanish Goths.

They repudiated their former wives, and determined by the precept of the priests to live a new life; they married sorely against their will the royal Gothic maidens and then began a record of crime, worthy the Borgias in their glory; the jealous, repudiated women seek the lives of the Queens, spy after spy is seized, who at their instance seek to murder them, and flayed or roasted them alive; at length one husband is privy to his wife's death, in order that he may have back his former state, and relapse from a poor attempt at a Christian life with the conservatism and consistency of a Frankish barbarism.

Christianity had not come unto France with the Romans or with the Franks, as alone it must come to make a people feel its power, like cloven tongues upon its teachers' heads, and like the rushing, mighty wind, potent to sweep away the vices, the crimes, the filthy coarsenesses of a barbarous people, and to leave behind it a calmer atmosphere, a serener sky, and the promise of a fruitful moral harvest.

Such then, under the Merovingian Franks, was the condition of Gaul; the Gauls strangely supine, now no longer enjoying the conquest for its novelty, but deploring it for its oppression. The country was divided into the kingdoms of Autrasia, Oster Rike or Eastern kingdom, Neustria, Neoster Rike, or Eastern kingdom, Aquitania, Burgundia and Brittany; these sometimes under one king as in the time of Clovis, and sometimes under many, as when divided among the children of a royal family.

We have said that the Gaulish race received little or no infusion from the Franks; they were governed indeed by these Franks, but little otherwise affected by the contact. Not so however the Neustrian Franks themselves; they had become as idle, enervate, and powerless as the Gauls themselves. The name of Clovis and his long-haired Merowings had sent an electric thrill of terror at his coming;

but not three centuries after the successors of these very renowned warriors limited their ambition to gratifying gluttony and lust, and to be driven about in clumsy chariots, drawn by trained oxen. These were the roi-faineans, the sluggard kings of the Frankish race. And here we have a special explanation to offer, and it is one which may chance to throw a little light upon these Roi-Faineans. The use of the word king in compendiums of French History is by no means the same as its use in English History. The kings of England are our standard ; the French Kings were only chiefs. We understand the kings of the Heptarchy, from war chiefs they had become kings ; we know how long it was before the King of the West Saxons became King of England ; but as for the kings of France, in the ordinary meaning of the term, there was no king properly so called of France, until Charles the Bald, the grandson of Charlemagne, and no king of the greater portion of the territory until Philip Augustus. The kingdom of France was very long in forming. It was the custom among the Franks to call the director of a warlike enterprise as well as the president of a peaceful commission, *Koning ;* and the name was applied thus to many inferior chiefs ; there were great chiefs, oberkoning ; less chiefs, unterkoning ; semi-chiefs, half-koning ; chiefs for the sea, sea-koning, army chiefs, heer koning, people's chiefs, folks koning ; and these konings were in every case elective.

Such, says a French writer, was the idea, which presented itself to the minds of the Gauls, when translating the words Frankodo koning into Latin, as *Rex Francorum* ; such was the true authority of the Chlodowigs and Karls, chiefs of the Franks, whom our modern historians, at once learning proper names and titles, call Clovis and Charles, kings of France.

Originally then, a French king was but a leader and chief of the people, in process of time he became a tyrant of the people, and his name a synonym for oppression, and the slavery and subjection of that people ; now the Roi-Faineans were kings, in the primitive meaning of the word, and when they became enervate, were deposed by the Franks themselves.

And now we come to a curious piece of philosophy, and one which, we believe, has been misunderstood. The compendiums tell us that when the assembly of the nation, observe it was the act of the people, had deposed Childeric the III, the last of the Merovingians, and placed

Pepin le Bref, upon the throne; the Pope sanctioned the election, and the Carlovingian dynasty took place. In proper language, if we may be critical, it was not Carlovingian but the dynasty of the Karolingi or Karlings, i. e., children of Karl.

But that will be admitted to be the explanation which the compends gave of the process, by which the dynasty was changed. Charles Martel struck the effete Government with a blow of the same hammer, with which at Tours he had demolished the Saracens and saved Europe; and tumbling the old race from the throne had placed upon it as the reward of his prowess, his own family, in the person of his son Pepin the Short, the chief steward of the palace. Pepin simply arranged the seat for Charlemagne. True in words, but most false and unsatisfactory in spirit.

The Franks of Neustria, the most populous and pleasant part of the new kingdom, had become enervated and Gallicised. The Franks of Austrasia, on the contrary, receiving constantly fresh infusions of the old Ripuarian spirit; coveting the goodly land of Neustria, and finding its first Frankish possessors now unfit to hold it, made the second Frankish invasion upon these, their imbecile brethren, and thus changed the dynasty, and renewed a vigorous Frankish rule. Thus Clovis and Charles Martel stand as the leaders of two distinct incursions of the French into Gaul.

But we must hurry forward to touch, but for a moment on other prominent matters. With Charles Martel came a new feature of monarchy. Charles wished his son not a konig or chief, but a real rex or king; he made permanent grants of land and titles, and thus established an aristocracy, unlike anything the Franks had ever seen, an aristocracy which was to strengthen the throne of Charlemagne, and be the hereditary stock of the old French Regime.

The sway of Charlemagne was over many petty kingdoms, acknowledging his crown, but entirely governed by dukes, counts and lords, who were themselves supreme in their own dominions. The lower people acknowledged only these barons, dukes and counts as their superiors; they heard, indeed, that there was a mighty Emperor, sometimes at Paris, sometimes in Rome; and they supposed that those whom he governed must fear him greatly, but those who

did not live on the routes of his progress did not conceive that they were in any degree amenable to him, and they were almost entirely right.

Charlemagne's was the perfection of Frankish rule. But now there came a new whirlwind from the North. The Danes, under the name of Northmen, urged by the spirit of maritime adventure, land on the coast of Neustria, and give cause of tears and lamentations to the far-seeing Charlemagne. While they were warring in England as Danes, they had no time to trouble France much, but when they made peace with Alfred, they returned in numbers and strength to France.

These Normans or Northmen were a hardy and impudent race ; they exposed their infants to let the weakly die ; the eldest son inherited his father's estate ; by a stringent law all other sons must migrate beyond seas ; no wonder they were pirates ; "and they are rightly termed sea kings," says a Norwegian writer, "who never seek shelter under a roof, and never drain their drinking horn at a cottage fire."

Their religion was martial and bloody ; if they fell in battle, Valhalla was theirs. "Whatever distinction of sects," says Wheaton, "may have existed among the Northern Pagans, the favorite god of the Vi-kingr, was a Mars and a Moloch." Having contented themselves at first with plunder they were now looking for a settlement. Under Rollo, Roll or Rou, that marvellous character, who is chronicled in the Roman de Rou, of Robert Wace, one of the distinguished Trouveres ; the Normans conquered Neustria, and had innate power to give it their name of Normandy. It is pitiful to see how the Franks were driven back by these fierce Northmen. Checked by Louis III, whom the Bards sang as a deliverer, they returned to the shock, until their conquest was complete, until Paris had been desolated, and an enervate king, Charles the Simple, had given them the fairest province in the world. There is a little anecdote of the time, which gives a very just idea of the relative bearing and courage of the Normans and the French at this time, of the light in which they regarded each other.

The cession of Neustria was made, and Charles the Simple had an interview with Rollo to receive his homage for the gift. When the assembled Franks beheld the Norman chieftain, struck with his martial bearing and commanding person, they declared he was worthy the seignior, with which he was to be invested ; among the ceremonies of homage was

kissing the king's foot; this Rolla refused to do, but deputed one of his followers to do it in his stead; "the insolent barbarian, lifted up the king's foot, which he offered him to kiss, so high that Charles was thrown backward on the ground, to the great amusement of the spectators." He had confirmed the gift, by the marriage of Rolla with a natural daughter of his own. With them came the Feudal system; it pervaded France and gave rise to those various distinctions, which led eventually to the destruction of the Carlovingian dynasty and the accession of Hugh Capet, Count of Paris, Duke of the Isle of France, Lord of Orleans and Burgundy, by power and territorial possession; the founder of the race of Kings which is now floating throneless over the surface of Europe. This Feudal system was afterwards taken from Normandy into England, by William the Conqueror. And this perhaps is all that the Normans brought unto the land of the Franks; they left everything else behind, and became acclimatized. They had no power even to impose their language, but adopted and indeed aided in forming that *Langue d'oui* which however it may differ from the *langue d'oc* boasts no very considerable infusion of the Teutonic roots.

We now come after having lost sight of them to a distinct trace of the Gaulish people. When the great Frankish and Norman lords, smitten with a holy zeal for the conquest of the Holy Land, sold their possessions to raise money for the crusades, they were purchased by Gaulish vassals. Often thus the rude Frankish confiscations returned into Gaulish hands, and thus began a new popular movement which, however slight, has never since ceased to be felt and, we may safely assert, never will cease to be felt. Strange to say, with equal steps came the monarchy; but this is strange only in appearance, for all the efforts of the masses had been directed, not against the monarch, but against the oppressions of the petty suzerains, and they regarded the monarch, who like them was trying to crush the power of the aristocracy as a friend and co-adjutor. So democracy and monarchy, went hand in hand in the new form of Frankish dominion, known as the Capetian Dynasty.

Philip Augustus united the great Fiefs of Eastern France in the XIIIth century, and stripped John of England of many of his French possessions; for England had possessed in the time of Henry II, twenty-eight departments, as at present divided and the whole of Armorica. And now began a new act in French History; one which made the Gauls forget the

difference of race, the Ethnic quarrel, and unite together bravely and boldly to defend the country against foreign invasion.

The wars, which were waged in France by England from the time of Edward III to Henry VI, united the French people to the monarch, and the aristocracy to both. until France was free from English dominion. They were all necessary to each other, monarch, nobles and *tiers-etat.*

Louis XI was an artful and designing Prince, coming to the throne in 1461. After this war was closed, he took advantage of this provisional, this temporary unity, to strengthen the perogatives of the crown ; in a word, now that the people were thus voluntarily but dangerously near the throne, he bound them to it with bonds of steel.

Francis I was destined to bring the French people, as a nation, into the great whirl of European politics. Louis XIV, the grand monarque, found that all these elements of kingly power was to make amends to the French people for a despotic rule, by the flattering unction, that they were the greatest nation in Europe. Voltaire called that age Le Siecle de Louis XIV. French diplomacy ruled Europe; French fashions modelled its courts ; the French langauage was the passe-partout; can you wonder that the French were proud of their golden chains notwithstanding their weight ? The question and issue of Race slept under an anodyne, which sent beautiful dreams through the ivory gate. *Candenti perfecta nitens elephanto.*

But it was to awake, like the drunkard from his intoxication, and the awakening was to be with redness of eyes and unsteadiness of gait throughout France, and Europe. Some there were even then who were weeping in secret and plotting in secret during these brilliant times. They had paid, they had bled for the honour and glory of the Frankish rule ; they would pay and bleed no longer. And in the intervals of Louis' glory, electric thrills of such a latent fury made themselves felt.

And thus when the historic prestige of Louis XIV had passed away; when Philip of Orleans with his *roues* and his filth had excited a disgust in Europe, when the councils of war, and the great proceedings of diplomacy were held in and issued from the ante-chambers of the Duc de Choiseul and the boudoirs of Mesdames de Pompadour and Du Barri, the principle of Race came back ; the Gaulish people rose from their supineness and recumbence ; the genius of the

conquest passed away forever. Yes, each day's history echoes forever!

The nobility of the Bourbons had traced itself directly to the privileged men of the days of Francis I; these declared their legitimacy in that their fathers had possessed the lands and persons of the villein Gauls in the days of Philip Augustus; these in turn claimed to come by lineal descent from Charlemagne or rather the grants of his grandfather Charles the Hammerer, and these to be the issue of the men who had spread terror and devastation, when they came with Clovis from the Scheldt to the Loire and from the Loire to the Pyrenees.

And now the approaching revolution was but the new quarrel between the two races, or in more correct phrase the Gaulish race, and the principles and forms of government, which the Franks had established. A French writer has called them two nations, hostile in their recollections, the one plotting to continue the rule of twenty centuries; the other to throw it off finally and forever. Such was the terrible significance of the questions and answers, which formed the revolutionary catechism. *Questceque le tiers etat? Tout! Qu a-t-il ete jusqu' a present dans l'ordre politique? Rien! Que demande-t-il? Etre quelquechose!* In this revolution incited by our example they attempted to do what America had done; but the English dominion here was but of a century only; it had not always been oppressive and when it was, it had been met from the first by a firm and manly resistance; the dominion in Gaul of Romans, Goths and Franks combined was of nineteen centuries, and of many successive masters. We occupied a territory separated from the seat of our oppression, by a vast ocean; they lived in the same land and were bound to their rules by a thousand ties of habit and consociation.

At length the shock of battle came; shall we wonder that it was a day of shuddering horror? We must confess to a strong sympathy with the French revolution; not its murders and lusts, not its Dantons and Desmoulins, its Heberts and its Barreres, not its atheism and harlotry; but with the effort of a mighty people to accomplish, at the last, that freedom, which they should have guarded with a more jealous care, at the first. The elements were surcharged, the thunder-storm came in fury, and, when it had passed away, the air was pure and the sky serener.

Read it in the light of Ethnic philosphy, and the noyades of Lyons and Nantes, the Mitraillades of Toulon the guillotines of Paris, were but the efforts of the infuriated Gauls to get rid of Frankish tyranny. They did not themselves call things by their historic names; they did not see the philosophical connections; but the feeling was instinct in their hearts, and the long accumulating wrath burst forth by its own spontaneous combustion.

The captives, snatched from the chains of twenty centuries, flung their unmanacled arms around them with a fury and a power, never before witnessed in history. God grant it may never again be seen! And Napoleon Bonaparte, now no riddle in history, was but the creature of the Revolution, the champion of the Gaulish people; the soldier of democracy. It has been objected that he was not French, no he was not a Frank, but he was of the same Keltic blood opposed to Frank, whose cause he had now espoused, and in which he had seemed gifted with superior strength.

We are apt to speak of great men, as of some undue, some extraneous element in history; not so, historic biographers fill but a necessary niche in historic philosophy. We would not undervalue their greatness or their labours,

> For ever since the iron days of old,
> Arose, amid the pigmies of their age,
> Minds of a massive and gigantic mould,
> Whom we must measure, as the Cretan sage
> Measured the pyramids of ages past;
> By the far reaching shadows that they cast.

But what Julius Cæsar, with his dandyism, his egotism, his pride, his *celeritas conficiendi*, witnessed in fifty pitched battles, was but the impersonation of Roman fashion, Roman egotism and Rome's unlimited extension; Clovis, the one historic name for the first wave of Frankish invasion; Charlemagne, the type of the second incursion and the higher type of a reproduced empire of the West; Philip Augustus, monarchy uniting with democracy, to keep down the nobles; Louis XIV the impersonation of France, in the great scale of European powers; and Napoleon the appointed deliverer to give the great French people freedom, and Europe democracy.

And when after Napoleon's defeat and exile, the old conquerors came back, even restricted as Louis XVIII was by the new constitution, it was a Punic faith, which in 1830 was

again broken. Charles X was the victim of the old quarrel. Had the French people been equal to the emergency, that would have been the end of kings; then the race was free, but they had borne the yoke too long, they felt giddy without it, so they made a lighter one, they created a citizen king, to whom they might always point and say; France is ours; you are but king of the French; we are now free; you, not we, are *litus;* we permit you to reign; while in reality they were ruled as much as ever. Could such a dynasty long remain?

We have already transgressed the limits of time, in which we might be permitted to draw conclusions from the language and dialects of France as to the races which have tenanted it; but that is so distinct and so beautiful a subject, that we must not now do it the injustice to touch it. And now having presented what we believe to be the thread of Ethnic Philosophy in French History, there remain certain conclusions or inferences to be stated before we close. And the first of these is, that there seems in the Geography of France, as the abode of its people, a wonderfully preserving and vivifying power.

In France we have seen the Gaulish race, maintaining its identity, its strength and its elasticity, when to the casual observer it seemed supine and lifeless. We see it under its oppressors, the hereditary foe of England, reclaiming its territory, prosecuting foreign wars, astonishing the world by its achievements. We have seen it, under the man of its choice, victorious over the combined troops of Europe, subverting obsolete systems of war, and teaching the whole world the true application of the art military.

Again, every great element in modern progress has passed through France on its way to Western Europe, and has been Gallicised in the passage. Christianity twice passed through France on its way to England. The Normans, who conquered England and introduced forms and methods, avenues and channels for Saxon law and government, passed through a refining process in France; the Norman law-forms which still continue in use in England never came from the North land, they are French; "Le roi le vent," is the signature of the king to a bill; "le roi s'avisera" is his respectable and delicate veto; "oyez" is the cry in the courts; and when in national conflict England's king would appeal to the chancery of Heaven, his banner cry is, "Dieu et mon droit." But again, the crusades sprang from France; were preached there, main-

tained by Frenchmen, sanctioned by a French Pope; the name of Frank, which had now compassed both races, was the name by pre-eminence given by the Romans to all Western Europeans. Chivalry, although of German origin owes its name, most of its war phrases, and how much of its romance to the transforming touch of the French genius for adventure and prowess in battle. But these are not even Frankish phrases, nor Frankish thoughts; no they spring from that Gaulish race, which in spite of their humility, serfdom, oppression, have stamped their Romanized name and nature upon every being and every institution which comes within its grasp.

We have spoken of Saxon adventure and Saxon success; that race, we have suggested as the great modern nomad; the great missionary race; not destined to infuse much of its spirit or institutions into continental Europe, although these had no great respect, but to act its lofty part beyond seas, and to reform and people the distant countries of the world. But if the Gaulish race be true to itself; what may we not now expect from their own soil, if in the day of their humility they could by the will of a monarch subsidize all Europe; now when they are free, for Louis Napoleon is but an accident of oppression, a declining ray of his uncle's glory, what will they not achieve? They lead the van in science; they instruct the world in art; and with the lighter refinements of fashion, potent moral instruments, they cover the globe. The philosophers of France in the dangers of the revolution, like Archimedes worked out their problems, until the tumbrel came. Its poets like Chenier, sang immortal strains until the death bell tolled; its reign of Blouse after revolutionary times told monarchy how precarious was its seat in those precincts; its armies, what had long lain silently and sadly under the veil of the peninsula and unjustly under the stigma of Waterloo threw it off with a rush and a shout, and a success at the Malakoff; the day is passed when Jacques Bonhomme may be derided; the day has come when he is to be respected and feared; his temporizing cry has been, as he was laughed at by Roman, Goth and Frank, just what his triumphant cry is now, "*Il viva bien qui viva le dernier.*"

We have thus, briefly demonstrated, that the ancient race in Gaul was Keltic; that it became completely Romanized, after the conquest of Cæsar; that it lay supine under Goth and Burgundian and Frank; that the French revolution was its marvellous apparition, after so many centuries of bondage and we have seen, as far as human foresight goes, that it has the elements of a brilliant future in its own hands.

# ARTICLE V.

## REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

### LIII.

### JACOB MILLER, D. D.

THE subject of the present sketch was born December 11th 1788, in Goshenhoppen, Montgomery Co., Pa. The place of his birth was one of the most intensely German districts in the Commonwealth and still retains this characteristic. He was the son of John Jacob and Hannah Miller, and was in infancy baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. He was reared under religious influences, in accordance with the views and practices of the Lutheran Church. On reaching a suitable age, he attended a course of Catechetical instruction, conducted by his Pastor, the Rev. Dr. Geissenhainer and, by the rite of Confirmation, was received into regular communion with the Church. His youth gave promise of more than ordinary success. He exhibited mental strength, peculiar to one of his age, and great diligence in efforts for self-improvement. His deportment was so exemplary and his character so stable, that he attracted the notice and won the admiration of his Pastor, who evinced a strong desire, that the young man should be educated for the Christian Ministry and encouraged in his preparation for the work. Having obtained the consent of his father, he early commenced his studies with Dr. Geissenhainer, under whose direction he continued, for the space of five years, their prosecution faithfully and successfully, and in no respect dissappointing the high expectations, which had been entertained in reference to the result. In the year 1808, his Preceptor, having received and accepted a call to the city of New York, he repaired to Philadelphia to complete his Theological studies, and placed himself under the instruction of Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt, who, at that time, had charge of a private Seminary for the education of candidates for the ministry.*

*This institution was commenced in 1785, and was in successful operation about twenty years. Here at an early period, in the history of our Church, were educated some of our ablest and most influential ministers.

On the removal of Dr. Geissenhainer to New York, Mr. Miller, although he had not yet finished his course of study, received a unanimous call from the united congregations of Falkner Swamp, which at the time included Goshenhoppen and Boyer's Church. This call may be regarded as an evidence of the strong hold he had upon the affections of the community, in whose midst he had lived all his life, and the confidence they had in his abilities as a preacher. He consented, in obedience to the advice of his Professors, to supply the vacancy temporarily, and to fill appointments, once in four weeks, until the completion of his studies. Soon after during the same year, on his licensure to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania, the call was renewed, which he accepted and, at once, entered upon the regular discharge of its duties. Here, among the people of his first charge, surrounded by the scenes of his childhood and the friends of his youth he labored for twenty-one years, "not only with acceptance," says the record, "but with profit." During this period Limerick and Schutz's were added to the charge.

In the year 1829, on the occasion of Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg's* resignation, as Pastor of Trinity Church, Reading,

*Henry A. Muhlenberg, D. D., was the oldest son of Henry Ernestus Muhlenberg, D. D., and grandson of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, D. D., so generally recognized as the Patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America. He was born in Lancaster in the year 1782 and after passing through a thorough and liberal education, he commenced his Theological studies under the direction of his uncle, Rev. Dr. Kunze of New York. In 1802 he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and immediately received and accepted a call from the Church at Reading. The union, thus formed, was one of uninterrupted harmony, for a period of twenty-seven years. He also, enjoyed the confidence and regard of his brethren in the ministry. He filled successively all the offices in the ecclesiastical body, with which he was connected, and was by the unanimous suffrage of the Synod retained in the Presidency, so long as the Constitution permitted. In the year 1824, the University of Pennsylvania conferred upon him the Doctorate of Divinity.

In 1827, his health, having become impaired by the sedentary character of his pursuits, he expressed a determination to withdraw from the active duties of the ministry and to retire to a residence in the country. As soon as the fact became known, the attention of his fellow-citizens was immediately directed to him as a suitable individual to represent them in the Congress of the United States. Urged by his numerous friends he finally acquiesced in the nomination. He was elected a member of the Twenty-First Congress and continued to occupy a seat in the body for nine years, with credit to himself and honor to his constituents. In 1837, he was tendered by President Van Buren a position in the Cabinet, as Secretary of the Navy, and subsequently the Mission to Russia, both of which he declined. In 1838, on the creation of the Mission

Pa., he was unanimously invited to become his successor, but, as he did not desire to make a change in his field of labor, being very much attached to the people, whom he had so long served and believing that he was usefully employed, he returned the call. Another importunate effort was, however, made to secure his services, which proved successful. After carefully considering the question and conferring with friends, in whose judgment he had reason to confide, he changed his decision and yielded his personal preference. He accordingly removed to Reading, on the 5th of May, 1829. The charge, at the time, embraced the congregation in the town, together with four others in the country, viz. Sinking-Spring, Alsace, Spies and Schwarzwald. He regularly preached in Reading on the morning of the Lord's Day, and in the afternoon in one of the country Churches, and for some years he officiated in the town, in an alternate evening service with the German Reformed minister, with whom he sustained the most friendly relations.

During Dr. Miller's residence at Reading, he was frequently invited to other positions in the Church, more eligible and important, but he had no disposition again to sever his pastoral relations. He was very much attached to his congregations and he knew this feeling was reciprocated by them. He continued their Pastor until his death, which occurred on the 16th of May, 1850, in the 62nd year of his age and the 42nd of his ministry, having been connected with each of his two charges, just twenty-one years. His health had been in a precarious condition for about a year, preceding his death. He was often subject to attacks of vertigo, one of which seized him in the pulpit during the services, preparatory to the Communion. The symptoms seriously alarmed his friends, and, in obedience to the advice of his Physician, he suspended his official duties with a view to his resuscitation. But as he found no relief and the prospects of his permanent recovery were very doubtful, he tendered his resignation as

to Austria, he was selected by the Executive, as peculiarly fitted to discharge its duties and was unanimously confirmed by the Senate. In 1844, he was nominated as a candidate for the Gubernatorial Chair of Pennsylvania, but during the canvass, with every prospect of a successful result, he was stricken down by the hand of Death to the grief of a large circle of admiring friends. He was the father of Hon. Henry A. Muhlenberg, who died in 1854, whilst a member of the Thirty-Third Congress, and of H. H. Muhlenberg, M. D., so highly esteemed, as well for his personal character, as for his intelligent and liberal efforts to advance the interests of our Church.

Pastor with the expectation, that provision would immediately be made for a successor. The congregations, however, refused to accept it. He was therefore continued as Pastor and the services of a substitute procured, in the hope that he might yet be able to resume his duties ; but his health gradually declined and this hope was dissipated. Although his illness was protracted and was one of great physical suffering, it extorted no expressions of murmur or complaint ; he bore his pains with patience and Christian resignation. He was submissive, cheerful, affectionate and happy, answerering words of inquiry, expressing devout gratitude to his Heavenly Father for the many mercies he enjoyed, and admonishing those around him to be strong in the faith. Conscious of his approaching end, he reposed with comfort and joy on the great truths of the Gospel, and welcomed death as the entrance into that world, where the weary are at rest.

On the occasion of his funeral, the long procession of mourners testified by their presence, that he was not less lamented in the community as a citizen than as a Christian Pastor. The Church, in which the exercises were held, was filled, and many of the audience were deeply affected to tears, as a touching tribute to the character and life of the deceased was presented by the Minister of God, in a tender and impressive discourse. The Rev. Dr. Demme, delivered the discourse from the words, "In my Father's house are many mansions ; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself ; that where I am, there ye may be also." The services at the altar and at the grave were performed by Rev. C. F. Welden.

Dr. Miller was married March 22nd 1813, to Anna Maria, daughter of the Rev. Dr. Gessenhainer. From this union there were four children, three sons and one daughter. The sons had claimed much of the attention of their devoted father, who watched over their interests, intellectnal and moral, with rare fidelity. They were young men of more than ordinary promise. According to general testimony they were model children. From choice they were all three engaged in the study of Theology, and were anticipating with delight their entrance upon the work. The eldest, however, took, as it was supposed, a severe cold, and in the Spring of 1833, only a few months before the meeting of Synod, when he intended to make application as a candidate, just as he was upon the threshold of the sacred office, he was transfer-

red to the upper sanctuary. Two years after, the second also died in the bloom of his youth. The third, and only remaining son, who was also designed for the ministry, now in accordance with the wishes of his father, relinquishes the study of Divinity, and directs his attention to the medical profession as one less sedentary, and requiring more active exercise. But he, too, in the course of two years, fell a victim to that insidious disease, which has so often blasted the fond hopes of friends, and consigned to an early tomb those whose prospects at one time seemed the brightest. The daughter, Mrs. E. N. Endlich, wife of John Endlich, Esq., late United States Consul to Basle, with her mother, still survives.

Dr. Miller was a man of marked, unquestioned ability. He possessed great quickness of thought, and fine powers of discrimination. His natural endowments, it is generally admitted, were of a superior order, and had been brought under the influence of careful culture. If his education had not been of so private a character and in earlier life, when his opinions were in a formative process, he had mingled, to a greater extent, with others of the same age and similar pursuits, we have no doubt, it would have been of great advantage to him; his views on some subjects would have been greatly modified, and the results of his life rendered more effective. His personal appearance was striking, such as to attract and command attention; his high expansive forehead and expressive, penetrating eye, reminded one very much of Daniel Webster. He would certainly have shone in the Halls of Congress, and in political life could have exercised an unbounded influence. He was honored in 1838, by the University of Pennsylvania, with the Doctorate of Divinity, but he never recognized, or used the degree. Any other title than that of *Jacob Miller, Lutheran Minister*, was distasteful to him.

As a preacher he occupied a front rank in our Ministry. His exhibitions of the truth were plain, strong and practical; the arrangement of his subject, always lucid and logical, his illustrations clear, and the matter solid and edifying. His manner in the pulpit was earnest and impressive. He was gifted with powers of eloquence, which few possess. His Church in Reading was large, but it was always well filled, and he had the undivided attention of his auditory, always averaging from eight hundred to a thousand, until the conclusion of the services. We remember, on a certain occa-

sion, hearing a gentleman of intelligence and judgment remark, that he had never heard Dr. Miller's equal in the pulpit, with the exception of Dr. Demme.

He enjoyed the confidence and love of his people, old and young, and was regarded by them as their personal friend as well as their Pastor. It was his regular practice to visit all his members, rich and poor, at least once a year. He often said that a Minister of the Gospel, if he wished to do good must have an acquaintance with his whole flock, and exercise a personal influence over every member. He appeared very much interested in the youth of his charge, and his Catechetical instructions made a deep impression upon their minds. "I was," writes an intelligent and influential member of our Church," one of his first class of Catechumens, and well remember the interest, with which I listened to his instructions and explanations of the Catechism and of the principles of Natural and Revealed Religion. His Lectures were adapted to the simplest capacity, and yet so clear that the impression made was lasting. His arguments, and even on many points his very words, yet remain in my memory. If any thing in his public Lectures was not understood, and he was asked privately for an explanation, it was given with the utmost kindness, and so thoroughly that it could not be misunderstood." He possessed fine social qualities, and, although naturally quiet and reserved, and to some apparently stern and rigid, he was a man of tender heart and warm sympathies, of a frank, genial and cheerful disposition. He was enthusiastic in his devotion to music. When a lad, it is said, he frequently rose from his bed at midnight and practiced on the Piano and Violin, until the day dawned upon him.

Dr. Miller wielded an immense influence. In whatever position he was placed, his power was felt. In the ecclesiastical body, with which he was connected, he was very prominent. He was a good debater and an able leader. If any measure was to be carried, it was deemed important to secure for it his countenance and support. Yet in consequence of the peculiar views, which he entertained on some subjects, he did not always succeed. His friends often differed from him, although they gave him all credit for sincerity and honesty. He was a man of strong prejudices and his memoir is instructive, as it illustrates the connexion between an individual's

early and subsequent life. Early influences and associations often give tinge or character to our whole future.

> *Quo semel est imbuta recens, servabit odorem*
> *Testa diu.*

One of his strong prejudices was seen in the great tenaciousness, with which he clung to the German language, and his violent opposition, manifested for a long time, to the introduction of the English into the services of the sanctuary. Whilst he recognized the English as the language of the land, he thought all persons of a liberal education, especially those of German extraction, should learn and speak the German, as excelling the English in copiousness, clearness and facility for expressing ideas. He would never hear the language disparaged or sneered at without an instant rebuke, earnestly offering words in its defence and successfully silencing those who ventured the attack. Although the English was used in his family and he spoke it with great fluency, with only a slight German accent, which was not at all unpleasant, he never employed it in any public service or official act. The German Parochial School, connected with his Church, would have been kept up by him, if it had been at all practicable, but the times were against him; it gradually declined and was finally abandoned. Although his prejudices often seemed inveterate and his opinions fixed and positive, still he was open to conviction. He was ever willing to have the opposite side presented and defended, and to furnish the explanation and arguments in support of his own views. He was ready to abandon his ground, when it was shown to be erroneous. When he was fully satisfied that the young people of his charge were growing up in comparative ignorance of the German, and that, therefore, religious instruction could not properly be conveyed to them in that language, he at once yielded his judgment and consented to the introduction of the English into the exercises of public worship. He also exerted his influence to procure the services of an English Pastor as a colleague;* with whom he labored in harmony until the close of his life.

*Rev. F. A. M. Keller was elected by an overwhelming majority, as Colleague Pastor, 1842. We remember, soon after he had taken charge, visiting his Sabbath School, numbering, at the time, over six hundred Scholars, an evidence of the great necessity for the introduction of the English language. There are now in the city of Reading four regular Lutheran Churches, viz: *Trinity Church,* in which the services are

Dr. Miller's strong feeling was also evinced in what might be regarded as an undue attachment to the Church of his birth. He thought it far superior, in its doctrines and its government, to all other Churches. He, however, never for one moment, supposed that there was no salvation out of the Lutheran Church. He did not exclude other religious denominations from the Christian fold or maintain that their systems did not possess many excellencies, or that they were deficient in opportunities for doing good, but only that no Church was comparable to the Church of the Reformation. He was accustomed to say, that it was the real trunk, that other Churches were mere branches, and the Catholic Church was a decayed stem.

He was also an uncompromising opponent of the General Synod of our Church. His objection to it was based principally upon the abuse of power by the ecclesiastical councils, in the early ages of the Church. He distrusted human nature. He had witnessed so many exhibitions of human frailty, that he thought such bodies might be used as a mere scheme for religious and even political influence, and that ambitious men, for the accomplishment of their own sinister purposes, might sacrifice the Church and the truth. It was also his opinion that these ecclesiastical associations interfered with the freedom of the congregations and destroyed much of their independent character. In his views of Church government he was very much of a Congregationalist. On every occasion he advocated the most ample, individual and congregational, liberty, consistent with religious truth and compatible with the interests of the Church. He was also at one period in his history strongly opposed to Theological Seminaries. He supposed that candidates for the Christian Ministry could accomplish more in private study, under the direction of some faithful Pastor, and thus more readily and successfully acquire the practical part of the work. But on this subject his views underwent a change, as he found the number of ministers could not be adequately multiplied for the wants of the Church. Still he did not favor a General

exclusively English, of which Rev. C. Rightmeyer is Pastor; *St. Matthew's Church*, also English, organized by Rev. J. L. Schock in 1841, of which Rev. M. Valentine is the present Pastor; *St. James' Church*, established in 1851 by Rev. F. A. M. Keller, the present Pastor, in which there is an occasional German service; and *St. John's*, exclusively German, of which Rev. J. J. Kündig is Pastor.

Theological Seminary. He preferred confiding the care of such an Institution to the supervision of the District Synod, which should be responsible for its proper management and carefully guard its interests. He did not sympathize with our Church, or with his own Synod, in efforts put forth on behalf of the cause of Foreign Missions. He thought, that, as a Church, we were not yet prepared for the work, that the multitudes of German immigrants, brought to our very door, had the strongest claims upon our attention. Although strictly temperate himself, he did not look with favor upon Temperance Societies. He had no confidence in Associations or any organization, which proposed to operate independently of the Church. He supposed that all such efforts would be unavailing, productive of no permanent benefit. He did not approve of Protracted meetings, nor did he ever hold public religious services during the week, except on the Festivals, appointed by the Church. He was also violently opposed to religious *Fairs* so fashionable, some years ago, in many of the Churches. On some of these points, however, his sentiments were considerably modified in the latter part of his life.

Dr. Miller was, as may be inferred from what has been said, a man of very positive character, great firmness, and of a strong, energetic will. He never compromised that which he supposed was right. Nothing could drive him from his opinions, when once formed, except conviction.

"Uumoved
Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified"

he was bold and fearless in the maintenance of his position. It was no spirit of defiance, but a calm decision of character, which attracted the admiration, even of those who felt compelled to differ from him in sentiment. Strange and inconsistent as it may seem, he was, in many respects, also a very timid man. He never entered the pulpit without great trepidation and fear, although as a preacher he was so much of a favorite and always secured attention. He sustained an unsullied character, and is represented by those, who knew him intimately, as being truly conscientious and upright, punctilious in the discharge of every duty, incumbent upon him, and executing with unswerving fidelity whatever trust was committed to his charge. He was a man of unostentatious benevolence, animated in his intercourse with those, to whom he

was attached by the most untiring kindness. His congregation, at the time of his death, regarded his loss as irreparable. "They felt," writes one who knew him well, "as if they would never again be supplied with a shepherd; for in the affectionate hearts of his flock, every other one was compared with him and found deficient. He will never be forgotten or cease to be loved by those, who enjoyed his friendship or sat under his ministry."

LIV.

FREDERICK RUTHRAUFF

was born on the 25th of October, 1796, at Greencastle, Franklin Co., Pa. He was the son of the Rev. John Ruthrauff, an evangelical and devoted Minister of the Gospel, who for many years preached in Greencastle and the vicinity, with great fidelity and success.* His mother's maiden name was Ann Maria Hamme. His parents, according to his own testimony, endeavored faithfully to train their children in the way they should go. "They were," he says, "pious, kind and affectionate, but rigid in their discipline." At the age of fifteen he attended a course of Catechetical instruction, conducted by his father, the good impressions of which were never effaced from his mind. "Although the truth," he remarks, "was, for a season, obscured by youthful follies and love of the world and its pleasures, my conscience remained a faithful monitor, and often severely rebuked me. Though I lived in sin, yet I was mercifully restrained from becoming entirely enslaved to its power." He continued to observe the habit of reading the Scriptures and of secret prayer, which had been taught him in his youth. The spark of grace seemed to remain unextinguished in his heart, which subsequently kindled into a glowing flame and animated his whole life.

In his childhood, whilst under the paternal roof, he labored on the farm and in the mill, belonging to his father. On leaving home, in the expectation of preparing for the mercantile business, he was for a time in a store, first at Martinsburg, Va., and then in his native place. Subsequently his plans were changed, and he determined to devote himself to the medical profession. An older brother, having removed to Washington Pa., he became a member of his family, and

*See Evangelical Review, Vol. IX, p, 384

in the year 1818, entered Washington College as a student. Here he remained two years. During his connection with the Institution he suffered from a severe attack of sickness, and very little hope was entertained of his recovery. His spiritual condition arrested his serious attention. He was visited by Rev. Drs. Wiley and Brown, who were faithful in their ministrations to his soul. The disease, however, took a favorable turn. With a vigorous constitution his system rallied, and he was speedily restored to health. But with his recovery his religious impressions vanished, and his good resolutions were forgotten. Still, God did not abandon him. He was a child of the covenant, the subject of frequent and importunate prayer, "a chosen vessel," designed, in the Providence of God, to carry the Gospel to many people. Soon after, during the delivery of a pungent and heart-searching discourse in the College Chapel, by President Wiley, he was awakened to a sense of his perilous condition, his guilt in trifling with serious things, and his exposure to the Divine wrath. The truth entered his soul like a barbed arrow. He determined to surrender his heart to the Lord, and to commence a new life in Christ Jesus. He went to his room, addressed his brother Jonathan,* who was also now a member of the Institution, on the subject of their salvation, and added, that "unless they repented and turned to God, they would both perish." The result was that they entered into a vow, that they would begin the service of God at once by erecting an altar of prayer in their room to the name of the Lord. This was the commencement of his religious life. At length he came to a perception of grace, free and boundless, through a crucified Redeemer, clung rejoicingly to it, appropriated the Gospel with its soothing words and heavenly promises, and enjoyed that peace of God "which passeth all understanding." He felt that he was a new creature. "It was," he writes, nearly fifty years after, on referring to this period, "like the dawning of the morning, some rays of light darting through clouds of ignorance, doubt and infirmity; and amidst many vicissitudes in my religious experience, I must bear my testimony to the fidelity of my covenant God, and the matchless grace of my Saviour. Indeed if any one, who was ever permitted to record his name among the followers of Christ, has reason to sing—

*See Reminiscences of Rev. Jonathan Ruthrauff, Evangelical Review, Vol. IX p, 390.

"O ! to grace how great a debtor
Daily I'm constrained to be !"

it is the writer of these lines."

This change in the views and feelings of young Ruthrauff exerted an influence upon his future plans and career· "It was indeed, "he remarks," the day of small things in the development, which gave a new direction to my whole life." He now gives up the idea of studying medicine, and with the consecration of his affections to the service of the Redeemer, he resolves thenceforward to devote all his powers to the ministry of reconciliation, to carry into execution a desire to preach the Gospel, which many years before had been awakened in his breast on a certain occasion, whilst listening to a young man, urging upon his hearers the claims of religion. In consequence of his father's embarrassed pecuniary resources, he was not permitted to complete his collegiate education. He therefore, immediately, in the year 1820, commenced his Theological course, under the direction of J. G. Lochman, D. D.* whose reputation as a successful instructor brought to his residence candidates for the ministry from all parts of the Church. To his venerable preceptor he evinced, till the last, the most cordial attachment, and frequently spoke of his valuable instructions. "The Doctor," he writes, "was interested in his work. He was a father to us all, always pleasant and communicative. He was easily approached, patient, ever ready to solve our difficulties, and devote his time cheerfully to us. His benevolent countenance and warm heart attracted his students to him." He continued his Theological studies for two years, when he made application for licensure to the Maryland and Virginia Synod, convened at Cumberland in 1822. Being unable to attend the meeting, in consequence of an attack of fever, the Synod appointed a committee, composed of Drs. B. Kurtz and D. F. Schaeffer, who subsequently examined him at Hagerstown, and invested him with ministerial authority. Having received a call to the Williamsport charge, he soon entered upon the discharge of his pastoral duties. This was to him an important field of labor, rich in experience and profitable in instruction. He refers to the pleasant Conference meetings, which were held during his connection with this charge, in which were united Dr. B. Kurtz, then Pastor at Hagerstown, Dr. C. P. Krauth, of Martinsburg, Rev. A. Reck, of Winchester, and Rev. J. Winter, of Gerardstown, Va. He speaks of these

*See sketch of Rev. Dr. Lochman, Evangelical Review, Vol. VI p, 15.

brethren as being of one mind, and engaged in earnest effort to promote the welfare of the Church and their own spiritual improvement. "We would come together," he says, "every six weeks and spend several days in preaching and discussing pastoral questions." In the Spring of 1826, he removed to Hagerstown and, in connection with Rev. J. Medtard, supplied Rev. Dr. Kurtz's place, during his absence in Europe, on an agency for the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. Here he remained, until the close of the year 1827, when he accepted a call to Lancaster county, which at the time embraced the congregations at Maytown, Marietta, Elizabethtown and Mount Joy. From this charge he was called to Gettysburg, Pa., May, 1832, where he continued as Pastor, just four years. His next charge was in Chester county, where his ministry extended over a space of seven years, and was crowned with the most abundant success. At the time of his leaving this field of labor, an old Quaker preacher, residing in the neighborhood, remarked, that friend Ruthrauff, by his faithful labors, had brought about a greater reformation among the people, than he supposed could have been accomplished during the space of fifty years. The influence of his labors here is still seen in all the congregations, and his memory cherished in affectionate remembrance. He often encountered the most violent opposition in his efforts to elevate the standard of piety and to promote the interests of the Temperance Reformation. Never perhaps did malignity exhibit greater bitterness than in its attacks upon this man, because of his fearless discharge of duty. He was, however, surrounded by warm, devoted friends, who appreciated his services. In the Spring of 1843, he accepted a call to Manchester, Md., where he was engaged about two years. Thence he was transferred to Milton, Pa. In this field he labored for nearly six years with much acceptance. He added to the Church a large number of members, many of whom are still among the most devoted and active in the Church; several of the accessions were from Roman Catholic families. He resigned this charge in 1850, and was then successively located at Loysville, Pa., Centreville, Pa., Mifflinburg, Pa., Wrightsville, Pa., and Littlestown, Pa., his residence at each of these places averaging not quite two years. In the Fall of 1858, he received and accepted a call to Worthington, Pa., where he closed his earthly labors, September, 18th 1859, in the 63d year of his age, and the 38th of his Ministry. He died after a brief illness. He was attacked with asthma on Monday; the next

day he seemed quite ill and thought he would not recover. He spoke calmly of his approaching end, and expressed a perfect willingness to die, if it were the pleasure of the Lord. He felt as if he could confidently commit his family to his covenant-keeping Father, who had always taken care of him. "In a review of his past life," he said, "he was deeply sensible of his many imperfections and short comings, that he was a poor weak vessel, yet it was a source of comfort to him to know, that his labors in the Lord had not been in vain, and that some, who had been brought, through his instrumentality under God, into the kingdom, were now waiting to receive him on the other shore." From Thursday he seemed to improve, and on Saturday was apparently quite well. He proposed to fill his regular appointments on the following day. At evening worship, the services were unusually protracted; he sang and prayed with deep fervor and great earnestness. He remarked before retiring, that he felt so well. But about two o'clock, disease again suddenly attacked him and at nine on Sabbath morning, his vital energies were exhausted, his manly form yielded, and his emancipated spirit, released from its tenement of clay, ascended to join the sacramental host of God's elect. So quietly and peacefully did he pass away, that one could readily adopt the sentiment of the poet:

> "There is no death; what seems such is transition,
> The life of mortal breath
> Is but the suburb of that life elysian,
> Whose portals we call death."

The people at Worthington had become devotedly attached to him and mourned with sincere sorrow his early removal from them. The funeral services, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, were largely attended. The exercises were conducted by Rev. Messrs. G. A. Reichert, L. M. Kuhns, A. C. Ehrenfeld, J. Wright and M. Schweigert. Mr. Reichert delivered a discourse in German, from the words, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation: Jesus Christ the same yesterday and to-day and forever;" and Mr. Kuhns in English, from that beautiful passage, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day,

and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

The remains of Mr. Ruthrauff lay, for some time, interred in the grave-yard at Worthington, but, a year ago, they were removed to the cemetery at Milton, which had been, for some time, the scene of his labors and is now the home of his family. A plain white stone, with the simple inscription of his name, and the date of his birth and death, marks his final resting place.

The subject of our sketch was married to Elizabeth Zeigler of Harrisburg, in November 1822, who, with five children, four daughters and one son with the ministry in view, still survives.

Mr. Ruthrauff was extensively and favorably known throughout the Church, and his death was an occasion of general regret. The Synod of East and West Pennsylvania, with both of which he had been connected at different periods in his ministry, convening soon after his death, unanimously adopted resolutions, indicative of their strong confidence in his character and appreciative of the important services he had rendered the Church. They refer to his "unfeigned piety, his earnest zeal, his active and faithful efforts and his sincere devotion to the interests of our beloved Zion;" they speak of him "as the fearless preacher, the successful instructor of the young, the faithful pastor, the advocate of vital godliness, the man of undoubted integrity." Even those, who differed most from him in sentiment, and were most ready to detect any frailties, that seemed to cling to him, acknowledged, that he was a good man, earnestly devoted to the work, to which he had consecrated his life, and desirous of advancing the cause of truth and righteousness.

From our own recollection and the testimony of others we are disposed to place, as the most prominent among the characteristics of Mr. Ruthrauff, his deep, unaffected and progressive piety. He was strong in faith and full of hope. His life was consistent with his principles and given up to much prayer and meditation. "I always felt stimulated," writes a ministerial brother, "by personal intercourse with him to become a better man and a more devoted Christian." "He was always," says another, "who was intimately associated with him, "wholly consecrated to the service of his Master. His walk and conversation gave clear evidence, that he was a good man in the highest sense of the word." He was entirely devoted to the work of the ministry, with which no

other objects were permitted to interfere. His highest aim was to lead sinners to Christ and build up saints in their faith. "I believe," writes one of his spiritual children, who is now connected with our ministry, "that love to God and zeal for his cause were eminently the governing motives of his life. He always exhibited the same devotional spirit, the same love to Christ and his kingdom, the same ardent longing for the salvation of sinners and the edification of the flock of Christ."

As a preacher he was earnest, deeply spiritual and practical. "He was," says Dr. Kurtz, "a sound theologian and an able sermonizer. His sermons were systematic and thoroughly imbued with Gospel truth." His language was simple, from choice and cultivation, that of the people; his manner solemn, his defense of the truth fearless, his exhortations powerful and effective. His appeals were very pointed and his rebukes often withering. Passing events and striking incidents were employed by him, as illustrations in his discourses, with happy effect. The truth produced an impression upon the heart, and the conversions under his ministry were numerous. "He preached," writes one who frequently listened to him, "the whole counsel of God. I think I can yet hear his clarion voice, thundering forth the appeals of God's word against the finally impenitent, and pleading with them to flee the wrath to come; then in the most tender accents, assuring his hearers, if they would repent, they would find mercy. With paternal solicitude he labored to bring Christians nearer the cross and lead them to higher attainments in the Divine life. How his own heart seemed moved, and the tears would start in his eyes, when he spoke of the love of God! He delighted to dwell upon 'Jesus and him crucified,' as his great theme in the pulpit." As an illustration, not only of his idea of what constituted the proper kind of preaching, but of the character of the man, the following incident may not be uninteresting. There was a certain minister, from whose sermons he had, at one time, derived great benefit, but who, at a later period, had very much departed from the plain, simple mode of presenting the Gospel, which he had adopted at the commencement of his ministry. Mr. R. had not heard him for many years. An opportunity having once more offered, he gladly embraced it. But how great his surprise and disappointment to find his manner and style so much changed. Meeting him the next morning he addressed him thus, "Dear Brother, last night I went to hear

you preach with the expectation of having my bread buttered on both sides, as I had, on former occasions, but alas! I got butter on neither side — it was hard crust!" He preached with acceptance in the German as well as in the English language. In the former he was regarded by many as quite eloquent and often powerful. "His full, strong voice, forcible emphasis and commanding appearance," writes one of our ministers, "gave that degree of life to his pulpit efforts, which always secured attention. I have never heard any man preach, who has answered to my ideal of Luther in the pulpit more than Mr. Ruthrauff." At the commencement of his ministry, he wrote out his sermons in full and read them. He subsequently changed his practice, and preached merely from a skeleton, without the manuscript. His prayers were characterized by great fervor; they were often overpowering and made a deep impression upon the hearer.

As a Catechist, Mr. Ruthrauff possessed great ability. Here he was always at home. He was ever successful in illustrating and enforcing the great truths of religion. "I have never known any one to equal him," says a communication now lying on our table, "in catechising. He was plain, simple, familiar, earnest and pathetic. He dwelt distinctly upon the doctrinal, practical and experimental parts of religion. His lectures were a complete system of Divinity, adapted to the youthful mind. Subsequently when I studied theology, as a science, I found that one of the very best preparations, which I had, was the course of catechetical instruction, which I received from the lips of this faithful pastor." He always placed a very high estimate upon this department of Christian labor, and often seemed to regret, that it was so much neglected by many of our ministers, or its duties so superficially performed. On one occasion, as President of the East Pennsylvania Synod, in his official Report, he used the following emphatic language: "I would here call your attention to the necessity of expressing our views on the subject of catechetical instruction, previous to Confirmation. This usage we consider one of the glories of our Zion, and in the hands of converted and faithful Pastors, it affords the best opportunity of leading men to a saving acquaintance with the Saviour of sinners. The faithful performance of this duty is, therefore, of the utmost importance." In seasons of affliction, at the sick-couch and in his counsels to awakened souls, he is said to have been very happy, so sym-

pathetic and kind, so full of love and instruction. He was also the devoted friend of genuine revivals of religion and of active efforts to promote the salvation of souls, and yet he never evinced anything like sympathy with fanaticism or approved of disorder, connected with the services of the sanctuary. Even those, who felt unwilling to endorse some of the measures which he adopted during seasons of religious awakening, were always satisfied as to his sincerity, and cordially admitted, that he acted consistently with his principles and was influenced by an ardent desire to do good.

Mr. Ruthrauff always manifested a deep interest in the young men of his charge, especially in directing their attention to the Ministry. He invariably submitted the question to all of promising talents and piety, earnestly urging them to a prayerful consideration of the subject, so that they might ascertain what God's will was in reference to them. There are now many, preaching the Gospel in different parts of the Church, who were brought under the influence of Divine truth, and introduced into the sacred office, through his instrumentality. He was also a faithful and uncompromising advocate of the Temperance Reform, at a time too, when it was unpopular to espouse the cause. He was in several sections of the country, one of its pioneers. When he was once convinced that he was in the path of duty, there was nothing which could divert or seduce him from his purpose. The threats and persecutions of those, who were opposed to him, never intimidated him. He was conscientious and courageous, bold as a lion in the presentation of the truth. He was very firm in carrying out his honest convictions, and this sometimes made him appear imperious and overbearing. Yet inconsistent as it may seem, he was very diffident of his own powers, and was ever ready to examine and weigh the reasons, which favored the other side of the question. Although his manner sometimes seemed harsh, and his language severe, he was at heart as tender as a child, and possessed great gentleness of disposition. He was strongly attached to his friends, and they, in turn, were most devoted to him. He had the faculty of inspiring confidence, and of awakening the warmest esteem. Often, too, he excited the most bitter hostility. He had strong prejudices. His was no negative character. There were in his composition some strong, affirmative points, and these would naturally arouse opposition. His course, too, was perhaps not always the most judicious. When his efforts were, however, well intended, they were often misun-

derstood, his words misinterpreted, and his character assailed. He lacked administrative power. He was deficient in tact. He would never have made a good General. He possessed a very transparent character. He was free and open, and always candid in the expression of his sentiments. There was in him no deception, no concealment of purpose. He never pursued a serpentine course. He could not manœuvre. He spoke just as he thought, and thought as he spoke. No one ever even suspected him of duplicity. When he encountered difficulties in his pastoral relations, and observed any disaffection among his people, or had reason to suppose that his influence was diminishing, he immediately sought a change. Sometimes, it may be, he was precipitate in his decision, but he thought otherwise. He imsgined another might succeed him, and be more useful to the congregation. On one occasion, when allusion was made to the itinerant character of his ministry, his reply was, "That the Lord was using him as an ice-boat, to break the way for others." Wherever he labored, he did good. We have the united testimony of several, who succeeded him in his different charges, "that they reaped much of the fruit of his labors." The results of his ministry were everywhere perceptible. The most wonderful changes on the subject of religion were effected. Even in those places where the tongue of slander was most busy in efforts to injure his character, and the most malicious reports were put in circulation, to blast his reputation, he triumphed over his enemies, and lived to see those, who had been most violent in their opposition to him, confess the injustice they had done him.

> "Virtue may be assailed, but never hurt,
> Surprised by unjust force, but not enthralled ;
> Yes, even that, which mischief meant most harm,
> Shall in the happy trial prove most glory."

Mr. Ruthrauff was never regarded as a man of great learning. As a scholar he did not take the highest rank in the Ministry. He had not the same opportunities for mental training, which are now afforded candidates for the Ministry in our Church, although at the time of his licensure he was considered well prepared for the work. After his introduction into the sacred office, his labors were so extensive and arduous, as to allow little leisure for studious effort ; yet he possessed a well-balanced mind, a large share of good common sense, and had made very respectable attainments.

His experience and observation were the great sources, from which he drew much of the material, which he used with advantage for the instruction and edification of his hearers. He accomplished more during his ministry, than many who have been more highly favored.

Mr. Ruthrauff was very much attached to his Church. He was a Lutheran by birth and by education. He loved its principles, its doctrines, its usages, its distinctive features. Yet he was no sectarian.

> "Bound to no party, to no sect confined;
> The world his home, his brethren all mankind,"

he was always willing to co-operate with Christians of all denominations in efforts to do good. He was very devoted to his family and seemed deeply interested in their spiritual condition. At Family worship, it was often his practice, to pray for his children, each one by name, thus producing in them the most solemn feelings and impressing them deeply with a sense of their obligations. It was quite common for him, also, to conclude this religious exercise, by repeating the Lord's Prayer, or the Apostles' Creed, in which the whole family united.

He was very fond of sacred music. He had a fine, melodious voice, and many will remember, how he loved to sing the songs of Zion. The exercise seemed to him always a source of great enjoyment. He often employed this talent with good effect. In preaching, it was his custom to stop in the midst of his discourse, when he saw any of his auditors sleeping, and to sing a few stanzas of a Hymn. It always had the desired effect and secured attention. Every eye was open, during the remainder of the service.

Mr. Ruthrauff was a man of fine personal appearance, tall, about six feet, well-formed, with an expanded chest, and of unusual muscular strength, neat in his dress, erect and dignified in his bearing. In a crowd he would have attracted the attention of a stranger. The last time we met with him was at the Convention of the General Synod, assembled at Pittsburg, in 1859. He presided at one of the meetings of the Lutheran Publication Society, and we suppose a man of more commanding, imposing appearance could scarcely have been selected for the occasion. During the whole of his active life, he enjoyed almost uninterrupted health, and gave promise of a long-continued career in the ministry, and of a

ripe old age. But neither health nor strength can evade the power of disease, or resist the strong arm of death.

Our friend has gone! His earthly labors have closed! Nearly forty years he was engaged in active, earnest, constant service in the Gospel ministry. How much good in that eventful period was accomplished, eternity will alone reveal! The train of influences, which he put in motion, will be felt till the end of time. He has now entered upon "the rest, which remaineth to the people of God." He has, doubtless, met in the realms of glory hundreds of those, whom he was the honored instrument of leading to the Saviour, whom God gave him as seals of his ministry, and has joined with them in the music of celestial choirs. A few years before his death, he revisited the scenes of his labors in one of his former charges, and seemed so much to enjoy the intercourse he had with Christian friends. "How happy," he writes, "I was, last week, in Chester County, in those blessed re-unions of heart and hand! But there will be a happier time yet in glory. That will be worth talking about. It will last!" He has now realized his visions of the future, and experienced that blessedness, which with so much confidence he anticipated, with the Father, in whose "presence is fullness of joy," and at whose "right hand there are pleasures for evermore." Although he may seem to us to have been prematurely cut down, in the vigor of life and in the midst of his usefulness, we must always feel, that the time, which God selects for his servants to close their work on earth, is the most opportune, the very best time. Even if to our imperfect vision it appears otherwise, it may be truly said of every faithful Christian, *Felix, non vitæ tantum claritate, sed etiam opportunitate mortis.*

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### LUTHER'S WORKS.

By Rev. E. J. Koons, A. M., Montgomery Co., Pa.

The following brief history of the different editions of Luther's Works, as a contribution to Bibliography, possesses value; and as it has not appeared in an English dress, we think

it well, that the Church and the world, which is shut out from German Literature, should know something of the deference, paid to the productions of the immortal Luther. The English press teems with editions of the works of those, who used the pen most industriously in the English tongue, whose separate treatises are perhaps numerically equal to Luther's, whilst the burning thoughts and vigorous language of Luther, which shook and shattered to its very foundations the religious fabric of Europe and modified the civil and literary order of things, are scarcely known but from the effects produced.

We think the idea a very erroneous one, that Luther's works are just the thing for *his* day, but possess no practical value for *our* day. His object was *one* and only *one*, to glorify God in the overthrow of the Papacy. The principles of that system do not change, nor does human nature change *essentially ;* consequently the reasonings against the Papal system can only vary in form. Luther's books against the Papacy, therefore, possess value. Again, his sermons and expositions possess value, because of their clear insight into the meaning of the Divine Word. We need have no better evidence of this, than his unparalleled translation of the Bible. One who can so clearly present its meaning, is able to profit those who attend to his instructions. And though we may not approve of all his inferences and deductions, we yet have that which is an emanation of the heart and mind, in every proper sense, influenced by the Spirit, and characterized by childlike simplicity.

It is proper to state that the facts here presented are a free rendering and modification of a contribution to the "*Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche.*" It professes to be a "Short History and Characteristic of all the complete editions of Luther's Works, with special reference to the Erlangen edition." There were in all six editions, but of very unequal value.

## I. The Wittenberg Edition, 1539–1558.

The earliest is the Wittenberg Edition, published in the years 1639–1558. John Frederick, the Magnanimous, desired that a complete edition of Luther's works should be published during the lifetime of the great Reformer. Luther was very unwilling, that it should be done, desiring much rather, that all his books "should remain in the back ground

and perish." As however he could not prevent the collection of them, he comforted himself with the the thought, that "in the course of time his books would be covered with dust and forgotten, especially those which by the grace of God had accomplished their object."

The editing of this collection he himself committed to M. George Rörer. He, aided by Caspar Creuziger, who died soon afterwards, superintended the first four German volumes. Having accepted a call from Denmark, George Major succeeded him. As long as Luther lived he always read the last proof himself. Immediately after his death, by changes in the text and omissions, a Calvinistic coloring was given to his productions. The entire edition consists of twelve German and seven Latin volumes.

The special history of this edition is as follows. Of the German volumes, the *first* was published by Hans Lufft in 1539 and contained a preface by Luther. The *second* volume was commenced during Luther's lifetime, in the office of Nicolas Schirlenzen. It was, however, finished in another office, only in 1548, because of the war disturbances and especially because of the imprisonment of the Elector. It contains a preface, reputedly Luther's, with an addition by George Rörer. But this does not so much bear the impress of Luther's own work as it does of a compilation from his works. The *third* to the ninth volumes were published by Hans Lufft. The *third* in 1550, containing Melanchthon's dedication to Christian, King of Denmark: the *fourth* in 1551, with Melanchthon's dedication to Philip, Duke of Slettin and Pomerania: the *fifth* in 1552, with George Rörer's dedication to the Count of Mansfield; the *sixth* in 1553, with Melanchthon's dedication to the Princes and Counts of Henneburg; the *seventh* in 1554, with Melanchthon's dedication to Joachim, Prince of Anhalt; the *eighth* in 1556, with Melanchthon's dedication to John, Margrave of Brandenburg; the *ninth* in 1557, with Melanchthon's dedication to Otto Henry, Count-palatine, Elector and Duke of Bavaria. The *tenth* and *eleventh* volumes were published by Thomas Klug in 1558, and contained dedications to Christopher von Steinberg, by Basil Faber and John Guden. The *twelfth* was also published by Hans Lufft with Melanchthon's dedication to the King of Denmark. The index to these twelve volumes was made by George Walther, the corrector of Lufft's publishing office, and issued by him in 1558. Single volumes of this edition were afterwards republished from dif-

ferent offices. To such an extent was this done, that from 1539 to 1600, one can count from three to four complete editions, none of which was arranged systematically as a complete edition.

The *first* of the seven Latin volumes was issued by Hans Lufft in 1545, and contained two prefaces, the one by Luther, the other by Melanchthon. In it Luther confesses, that in his first books, from humility, he had conceded many important points to the Pope, which he afterwards condemned as the greatest abominations and blasphemy against God. He, therefore, besought those reading them to do it with caution and with great compassion. The *second* volume appeared in 1546, with Melanchthon's preface, in which an account of Luther's life was given. The *third* in 1549, containing Melanchthon's dedication to Albrecht, Margrave of Brandenburg; the *fourth* in 1552, with Melanchthon's dedication to John Frederick, Duke of Saxony; the *fifth* in 1554, with Melanchthon's dedication to Wolfgang, Prince of Anhalt, all of which were published by Hans Lufft. That the *sixth* and *seventh* volumes (1555–1557) were issued from the same place is, indeed, probable, but has not yet been satisfactorily ascertained. In opposition to these, there is a *sixth* volume known, which was published without a dedication, by Laurence Schwenk, and a *seventh* volume dedicated by Melanchthon to Barnim, Duke of Pomerania, by Thomas Klug in 1558. Selections from the Latin volumes were also reprinted, but never the whole.

As far as the intrinsic merits of this edition are concerned, it is remarked,

1. That it does not contain Luther's writings only, but also some by Melanchthon, Regius, Bugenhagen, Menius and others.

2. Besides the original German works, there are numerous badly executed translations from the Latin.

3. There are wanting, in addition to some polemical works, more than five hundred productions of Luther, which found a place in subsequent editions.

4. The succession of writings is not chronological, but, as Luther himself would have wished, arranged according to subjects.

5. The text has been corrupted in various places by arbitary omissions and changes. For instance, in the second volume of 1448, (which Nicolas Amsdorff observed already in 1549), in the book entitled, "That the words, This is my

body, yet remain firm," more than a leaf and four entire paragraphs are omitted. In like manner in the "Sermon on the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ against the Fanatics," issued in 1526, many passages were altered.

## II. The Jena Edition.

After John Frederick, Elector and Duke of Saxony, by his imprisonment had lost his Electorate and the University of Wittenberg, he established the University of Jena. Here, before the Wittenberg edition of Luther's works was completed, he arranged for the publication of another edition, to be more carefully prepared, and more faithful than that one. To this end, the first issues of Luther's works were carefully collected. George Rörer was recalled from Denmark, appointed Librarian at Jena, and intrusted with the correction and supervision of the printing. John Aurifaber, Court preacher of Weimar, was the editor assisted by Matthæus Ratzenberger, a much beloved friend of Luther, Nicolas Von Amsdorf, the exiled Bishop of Naumburg, Stoltz, Court preacher of Weimar, and others. The Elector, it is true, died in 1554, but his sons, John Frederick the Second, John William, and John Frederick the Third, or youngest, continued the undertaking, in accordance with the intention of their father.

The eight German volumes were all issued from the office of Christian Rödinger, and his heirs. The building was formerly a Carmelite convent. The *first* volume was published in 1555, with a preface by Nicolas Von Amsdorf, and, also, with Luther's preface to the first division of the German works of the edition of 1539. Because, of a textual change, permitted in this divison by Rörer, a faithful adherence to the original text was insisted upon by Ducal rescript. The *second* volume appeared, also, in 1555, with a very short preface by Amsdorf. The *third* and *fourth* volumes appeared in 1556; the *fifth* and *sixth* in 1557; the *seventh* and *eighth* in 1558.

These volumes were again published as a complete edition, from 1560–1564; and, also, from 1575–1580. Separate portions were so often re-published, that is not possible to ascertain which belong to the same edition. The Register was prepared by Timothy Kirchner of Assenburg, Court preacher at Amford. It was first published in 1564, in folio, and again issued in 1592.

The four Latin volumes were published at Augsburg. The *first* from 1556–1558; the *second* in 1564, and subsequently; the *third* 1579–1584; the *fourth* from 1600–1612. Separate parts of them were immediately re-printed, as for example, the *first* in 1612; the *second*, 1600; the *third*, 1603; the *fourth*, 1611.

In accordance with the Ducal decree, this edition should have the following characteristics:

1. No changes, either in the sense or in words were to be made.
2. Every article was to be published in its original language, and in no part was a translation to be admitted.
3. The chronological order was to be observed as much as possible.
4. Articles, not originating with Luther, were, with very few exceptions, to be excluded.
5. A careful comparison with the original editions must be made, and the arrangement be the same.

In these respects the Jena edition is far superior to that of Wittenberg. Not only is the excellent "Interpretation of Genesis," which appeared at Nürnberg already, in 1554, in four volumes, and was yet included in the Wittenberg edition contained in this, but, also, the "Interpretation of the first twenty-five Psalms," which are wanting in the Wittenberg collection, besides more than five hundred other writings of Luther, including the letters, which came to light at a later period.

*The Eisleben Supplementary Volumes*, 1564–1565.

John Aurifaber, the Court preacher of Weimar, who had collected with great diligence the yet unpublished writings of Luther, had suggested to the Elector already, before the commencement of the Jena edition, that it might begin with some of Luther's works, hitherto unpublished. "He was confident, that he could gather two thousand of Luther's letters. The wife of Spalatin had two hundred; Dr. Jonas, two hundred and fifty; he knew of forty places, where manuscripts of Luther could be found; and Luther's children had a large case full, which the Elector Moritz and Melanchthon had long since endeavored to obtain. In addition to these, M. Rörer had a priceless collection of Luther's sermons, which he wrote out from 1523 to 1546, during their delivery. Also, expositions of many books of the Bible, Colloquies, Table-Talk, Counsel and Disputations, which had

never been published in a complete form, and which would make many volumes." But the Elector answered, "It is a question, whether it be good to publish everything that Luther has written, including his letters, and whether in this way his other writings would not be forgotten. Besides, he was not able to cover the cost, as he was already overloaded with editions."

This occasioned offence, and was carried so far that Aurifaber drew upon himself the ill-will of John Frederick the Second, and, as a consequence, he lost his position as Court preacher. He determined, on that account especially, to publish at Jena, the manuscripts of Luther, which he had gathered. But, because the publisher of that edition threw difficulties in his way, he carried out his intention at Eisleben, where he was remunerated by Count Mansfield. The first volume appeared in 1564, with a dedication to the Counts of Mansfield. The second volume appeared in 1565, with a dedication to the Emperor Maximilian II. A promised third volume never made its appearance. The manuscript of it was purchased after the death of Aurifaber, from his widow, by Julius, Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg-Wolfenbüttel, and brought to Wolfenbüttel. It was subsequently placed in the University Library at Helmstädt. After the abolition of this University, it was removed to Göttingen, and thence to Wolfenbüttel, where it still remains.

In the year 1796, Paul Jacob Bruns published, in quarto form, a part of these manuscripts, under the title :—"Unpublished Sermons of Dr. Martin Luther, on several Chapters of the Gospel by Matthew." Dr. G. K. Bollman republished this volume in 1817, increased by thirteen more sheets, but it received so little countenance, that he was unable to continue the printing. In 1847, however, the present Secretary of the Ducal Library of Wolfenbüttel, Dr. W. Hock, undertook to continue the publishing of these manuscripts. The title given was :—"Dr. M. Luther's Unpublished Sermons, Vol. 1st. Sermons on John, 3–4, 10, and Matthew 23, 37–24, 34." It was first published at Berlin, in 1847 and 1848. This valuable undertaking is worthy of our best wishes for its success.

The two volumes issued by Aurifaber were republished at Leipzig, in 1603. The writings of Luther, presented to the public in these volumes, are found with very few exceptions, neither in the Wittenberg nor in the Jena edition, and are arranged chronologically until the year 1538.

## III. The Altenberg Edition. 1661–1664.

The fact, that notwithstanding the special requirement of the Electoral agenda of Saxony, many of the established Churches were destitute of Luther's works, induced Frederick William, Duke of Saxony, to prepare a complete edition. The work was committed to Dr. John Siegfried Sagittarius, chief chaplain in ordinary to the Duke. The *first four* volumes, in folio, appeared 1661, the *four* following in 1662, the *ninth* in 1663, the *tenth* in 1664. This edition is dedicated to its originator, Duke Frederick William. It professes, according to Sagittarius, to have four hundred and fifty articles embodied, which are not found in the Jenaian edition. Notwithstanding this, however, it is the most defective and incomplete of all.

1st. The Latin works, in the original, are entirely omitted.

2d. Of the Latin works, those only are admitted which were translated before Sagittarius, the number of which is comparatively small.

3d. Partly through inadvertence, partly through a wrong application of the principle, upon which selections were made, compositions were admitted which were not Luther's. For instance, Luther's "Short Reply to the Clamor of some Papists concerning the 17th Article," and "The Decision of the Committee of Cardinals with Luther's Comments, 1538," which are found in the earlier editions are here omitted. Again, there are many other works printed twice.

4th. Finally, of Luther's German writings, the Church-postils, the House-postils, his Table-Talk, and those works collected at a later period (1702) by Buddeus, and published in the Halle Volume, are omitted. Besides these a large number of letters, and many excellent prefaces, written by Luther for the books of other men, are not even mentioned.

The first eight volumes of this edition are, especially, purely a reprint of the Jenaian eight German volumes, with the necessary enlargements from the Wittenberg and Eisleben volumes. The ninth volume contains the explanation of Genesis, according to the translation in the Wittenberg collection. The tenth volume contains the principal index, and as far as the compass of this edition is concerned, is judicious and useful. This edition was so little in demand in Germany, that a whole cargo was sent to Russia by sea, and was lost by the wreck of the vessel. Another large part of the edition was preserved in one of the towers of the wall

around Altenberg, as late as the beginning of the 18th century, but no one cared or concerned himself about it.

### *The Halle Supplementary Volume.*

Inasmuch as there was yet a large number of Luther's works unpublished, and also several others, that had been published separately, but had never found a place in any of the complete editions, John Gottfried Zeidler undertook the publication at Halle. He issued a folio volume in 1702, containing for the most part Sermons and Prefaces by Luther, but also an explanation of the Ten Commandments made in 1516 and 1517, the very rare translation of the Psalms of 1524, the Augsburg Confession, and a few of the writings and prefaces of other men. The most of this volume was at hand in a printed form, very little of it having been taken from manuscript sources. A second volume, which was promised, never made its appearance.

## IV. The Leipzig Edition.

This edition was edited by Dr. John Gottlieb Pfeiffer, and Dr. Christian Frederick Börner, assisted by M. John Jacob Greiff, who compared the Altenberg edition with original sources, and corrected it, translated for the first time many of the Latin works, and completed the index. The *first four* volumes appeared in 1729; from the *fifth* to the *tenth* volumes in 1730; volumes *eleven* and *twelve* in 1731; volumes *thirteen* to *eighteen* in 1732; volumes *nineteen* to *twenty-one* in 1733; volume *twenty-two* in 1734, and the index in 1740. The order followed is not chronological, but according to subjects. This edition is in every respect more complete than that of Altenberg. It embraces all contained in that edition, also the Halle supplementary volume of 1702, numerous works not before published, others which had been published only as separate volumes, and many of the Latin works, not before translated.

Notwithstanding all this, it is yet very defective.

1st. All the Latin works in their original language are omitted.

2d. Of these one hundred and sixty-nine are omitted in translations.

3d. It contains a great many typographical errors, occasioned by too rapid printing, and an avoidance of the necessary expenditure. The loud complaints of the publisher

were at fault. Dr. Börner furnished prefaces for the works contained in the first sixteen volumes: from the remainder he stood aloof, professedly because he himself intended preparing a book concerning these. The index is carefully prepared and of great value.

## V. The Walch Edition.

The index of the Leipzig edition had not yet appeared when Gebauer, a book merchant of Halle, commenced (1739) another edition of Luther's works. The direction and supervision of this edition was committed to Dr. John George Walch, Professor at Jena. It was pnblished in 1740–1753, in Quarto form. The *first nine* volumes contain the exegetical works of Luther; the *tenth* his so-called Catechetical works, that is, productions whose subjects follow the order of his Catechism; the *eleventh* and *twelfth*, the Church-postils; the *thirteenth*, the House-postils; the *fourteenth*, the Prefaces, the historical and philological works, together with the Latin translation of the Bible; the *fifteenth* to the *seventeenth*, the historic works, treating of the Reformation; the *eighteenth* and *nineteeth*, the controversial works against the Papists; the *twentieth*, the controversial works against the Sacramentarians, Jews and Turks; the *twenty-first*, the letters, with an appendix; the *twenty-second*, the Table-Talk; the *twenty-third* and *twenty-fourth*, the several indexes together with the life of Luther, and the history of his works. In the prefaces and introductions to each part Walch has given the necessary historical and literary remarks concerning, the works embraced. Without controversy this edition is the most complete and convenient of any published up to this time. It contains many productions not before published, besides others, already printed in separate volumes; also many Latin volumes, first furnished in translations, and a large number of the historical (Reformation) and polemical writings of others, calculated to elucidate those of Luther. Notwithstanding all these virtues it has its imperfections.

1st. It does not give Luther's Latin works in the original. These are given only in translations, and besides the older ones frequently present, in their translated form, considerable deviation from the sense of the original. To such an extent does this occur, that learned Theologians have, alongside the Walchian, the Latin volumes of the Wittenberg or Jenaian editions, together with such special publications as are want-

ing in either or both of the editions, last mentioned. For instance, the "Explanation of Genesis," published in *four* quarto volumes, at Nürnberg in 1554, and the "Explanation of the first twenty-five Psalms, printed at Nürnberg in 1559. Even when all this is had, every hundred years brings to light other works of Luther, and a deficiency in these editions is felt.

2d. The text of this edition does not give the full force of the printed and manuscript sources, selected as its basis. It is abundant in its assurances, that it has been carefully compared with the original editions, but it does not give the Bibliographical notes of the sources used, and therefore affords no guaranty for the genuineness of the text. And as many of Luther's works were published at Wittenberg two and three times a year, with all kinds of alterations, or, in the course of time, revised and enlarged, were again laid before the people, to say nothing of the many reprints with wicked variations, concerning which Luther complained so bitterly, it was especially difficult to know whether, after all, the proper original source had been used. Just so in Walch's edition, it is difficult in many places to determine, whether the manuscripts used were the original ones, or only copies, and where they are preserved.

3d. The language of the Walchian edition is not the language of Luther, but that of his editor. In order to adapt it to the reader, not only have original forms disappeared, and innumerable small words been either introduced or omitted from the text, but also numerous proper predicates, exchanged for others, which sometimes changed, and sometimes perverted the sense. In addition to this, whole clauses and sentences have been omitted through negligence.

4th. Finally, all those *letters*, *opinions*, *prefaces* and *sermons*, are wanting in the Walch edition, which have been first brought to light since 1753, by Lingke, Riederer, Schütze, Faber, Strobel-Ranner, Bruns, Bollman, Höck and the Erlangen edition. The compass of these works is neither small nor unimportant.

## VI. The Erlangen Edition, 1826–1849.

Two causes seem to have produced this edition. The defects of the Walchian edition impressed the originator, the late Mr. Charles Heyder, with the need of another. The newly awakened spiritual life in the Protestant Church also

influenced the mind of this devoted Christian to commence in 1826, at Erlangen, a new cheap, convenient, and at the same time as complete as possible, *hand edition* of Luther's works. The original languages were to be followed. In the advertisement it had been promised, that this "should not be a mere reprint of earlier editions, but should, with the use of all accessible helps, furnish a *new, revised text.*" The following principles should especially control the collation:—

1. Each article must be compared with the oldest editions.
2. The text of the new edition to be that of Luther's own revision, compared with subsequent editions.
3. All prefaces and dedications by compilers and translators to be excluded.
4. Each division to have a brief historical introduction prefixed.
5. The orthography and punctuation to be adapted to the present fundamental principles upon those subjects. Idioms, however, are to remain unchanged throughout.
6. Complete indexes are to be given to the whole.

These fundamental principles have not been fully applied in the homiletical division, (vols. 1–20,) because the greater part of it did not flow from Luther's own pen, having been written out by those who heard him, but notwithstanding this, judges will not deny that, in the following forty-four volumes, more has been given them than was promised. Criticisms upon this edition have been rare. During the long period of twenty-three years, not a single periodical entered into a critical examination of the contents and peculiarities of it. A reason for this may be based upon the difficulty of the work itself. What appeared in several Theological journals in 1826 and 1827, and in the *Jena Literary Gazette*, with reference to it, was more an advertisement and recommendation than a criticism. The periodical paper of Rudelbach and Guerike for the whole Lutheran Theology and Church, approvingly as it expresses itself upon the handling of the text, does not so present the edition as to furnish the reader with a vivid picture either of its character, or of its relations to the earlier editions. We believe, therefore, that we do a service to all, who could and should interest themselves for a speedy completion of the Erlangen edition, by presenting the most necessary things upon these two points.

Without mentioning, that this is the first edition for 236 years, which gives Luther's Latin works in their original, it is also the most complete and the first critical one, which

gives the original text in its integrity. The last Latin edition of 1600—1612, does not even contain all the works, printed at that time. For instance, the excellent interpretation of Genesis, issued at Nürnberg in four volumes in 1554; brief interpretations of the first twenty-five Psalms, and some of the following ones, published by Veit Dietrich's heirs at the same place, in 1559; Luther's Latin letters, edited by Obsopöus in 1525, by Flacius in 1549, and by Aurifaber in 1556. Besides these we may mention the large number of Latin letters, thoughts, prefaces and other works which were first published in 1702 by Buddeus, in 1720 by Löscher, in 1740 by Schwartz, in 1765 by Riederer, in 1780 by Schütze, in 1814 by Strobel Ranner, and in 1825 by De Wette. The first two mentioned larger works the Erlangen edition has already furnished in twelve volumes, and the remaining will be furnished at their proper time and place. In like manner it has supplied a volume of the German works, wanting in the Walchian edition. Immediately after this volume two others were furnished, and at a later period the remaining ones in their place.

The superiority of this edition over every other rests indisputably in the restoration of the original and pure text, according to the original one, printed at Wittenberg under Luther's own eyes, together with the retention of all idioms. The only variation is in the adaptation of the orthography and punctuation to that in use at present. As is known, many of Luther's works, as found in the first Wittenberg edition, had undergone a Crypto-Calvinistic distortion, and also at a later period, partly because of an effort to adapt Luther's German to the vocal sounds of the eighteenth century, and partly through carelessness in the management of the first proofs and of the texts, such a number of changes, additions and omissions in nearly all the complete editions, but especially in the Walchian had crept in, that it would be incredible, if the proofs of it had not been furnished in the Erlangen edition in foot-notes. Whoever will put himself to the trouble to count, will find that in the first eighteen German volumes of the second and third divisions, not less than ten thousand four hundred and four variations of the Walchian edition have been collated and corrected. A great part of these, it must be conceded, do not destroy the sense of the original, but it is equally undeniable that another great part do distort and pervert the sense.

In what sense the language of Luther, as the peculiar impress of his own spirit, is left unchanged, is perceptible in this, that not only the form and expression, syntax and phraseology is retained, but the sound of the words itself is so strictly reproduced, that neither a vowel nor a consonant, which is heard in reading the original edition, has been changed or omitted.

As additional superiorities of the Erlangen edition, we may, with propriety, mention the following:

1. In the earlier editions, the oftentimes incorrect and incomplete quotations from the Scriptures, and the changes of name, which occur, as for instance, Peter for Paul, Jeremiah for Hosea, are corrected.

2. In the older editions, the Hebrew and Greek words are printed in Roman and German characters; in this, for the first time, they are given in the characters, peculiar to those languages.

3. The introductions, containing the literary history, the Bibliographical review of the original issues, and the reference to the edition copied in the several older collections, are prefixed to every separate work, so that there is no necessity for a laborious, and oftentimes, vain search for these, as is the case in the Walchian edition. As far as the Bibliographical sketches of the original editions are concerned, these must especially be regarded as the more welcome, because unfortunately as is known, not a single Library in Germany possesses a complete collection of them, not even a proof exists that the various works have been compared and arranged in order upon Bibliographical principles. The proofs of the variations of these editions often rest, as Reiderer, Schwartz, Panzer, Beesenmeyer and others have shown, upon minor typographical errors, (as, for instance, an *i* without a dot). The notice of such errors would seem like pedantry, if upon a close inspection textual variations were not found. It is, therefore, on no account a matter of indifference which text of the older editions is given in a new one. The Erlangen shows this minutely in connection with every separate work.

# ARTICLE VII.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Memorial Volume of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity, Lancaster, Pa.* Discourses delivered on the occasion of the Centenary Jubilee. By Rev. C. F. Schaeffer, D. D., and Rev. Prof. F. A. Muhlenberg, A. M. With additional Historical Particulars, from A. D., 1761–1861. Lancaster, John Baer's Sons, 1861. This is a valuable volume, rich in matter of the most interesting character, and well would it be, if all our older congregations were to engage in a similar effort to rescue from obscurity the important materials, connected with their early history. With every successive year, as the links, binding us to a former generation, are passing away, the difficulty of doing the work increases. Dr. Schaeffer and Prof. Muhlenberg, whose discourses the volume contains, have executed the task assigned them, with great ability, with that taste, judgment and success, which characterize all their efforts, whilst Mr. Krotel has rendered a most important service by gathering together facts and statistics, interesting not only to the congregation, of which he was, for several years, the honored pastor, but to our whole Lutheran community.

*The Puritans, or the Church, Court and Parliament of England, during the reigns of Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth.* By Samuel Hopkins. In three volumes. Vol. III, Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1861. This great work, in three elegant octavo volumes, is now completed, and, in announcing the appearance of the third volume, we repeat the high praise we so cordially bestowed upon its predecessors. It is a noble contribution to our knowledge of an age, so prolific in remarkable events and heroic men. The author has reared a monument to his own name, whilst he has made a most valuable addition to the history of England and the literature of America. The work is well adapted to interest the reader. There is great skill displayed in portraying character, the style is vigorous and attractive, the narrative fresh and the history suggestive. The better we become acquainted with Mr. Hopkins as an historian, the more are we disposed to respect the thoroughness and candor of his investigations.

*Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. Being the Hulsean Lectures for the year* 1859, *with notes critical, historical and explanatory.* By C. J. Ellicott, B. D., Professor of Divinity, King's College, London: Late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1862. The author of these Lectures is well known by his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, and in this volume, as in all his other works, he shows himself a ripe scholar. There is presented a clear, simple and practical discussion of the most prominent events in the life of our Lord during his sojourn on earth, constituting a harmony of the Gospel narrative, in a form, well fitted to impress and edify all, who are interested in sacred studies. The work is designed, in a measure, to meet and refute infidel tendencies and sceptical criticism. Every page seems to be the result of deep thought and careful investigation, written in an evangelical, earnest tone, and in a style concise and intelligible to the student of the Scriptures.

*A Text-Book of the History of Doctrines.* By Dr. K. R. Hagenbach, Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. The Edinburgh Transla-

tion of C. W. Buch, revised with large additions from the fourth German edition and other sources. By Henry B. Smith, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary of the City of New York. Vol. II, New York: Sheldon & Co., 1862. In a former number of the *Review*, on the appearance of the first volume, we spoke of the general plan and great merit of this excellent work. The present volume is even more attractive and valuable than the preceeding. The American Editor, so well qualified for the task, has made many important additions and substantial improvements to the book. As the information, which this History furnishes, is so constantly needed, no one, interested in the study of Theology, can well afford to be without the work. We notice a few inaccuracies, which we should be glad to see corrected in a subsequent edition of the volume. On p. 450, it is said, "The American Lutherans generally reject the strict doctrine of consubstantiation." This doctrine has always been repudiated by the whole Church, and the repetition of the charge is very offensive. Also, on p. 309, we find the word *consubstantiation*, enclosed in Parentheses, as though the expression occurred in the original German of Dr. Hagenbach. The word is the Translator's, and, therefore, instead of the Parenthetical marks, Brackets should have been employed. On p. 450, the term *Evangelical* is applied to *Gettysburg Lutherans*, just after the expression *Moderate Lutheranism of the Pennsylvania Synod*, as if the latter were not entitled to the designation of *Evangelical*, which they have used from the very beginning of their history. Two of the Gettysburg Professors are members of the Pennsylvania Synod. On p. 443, the name of the Patriarch of our Church is printed Muhlenburg, instead of Muhlenberg. On p. 447, *Princeton Repository* should read *Repertory*. Professor Stuart's connection with the Seminary at Andover, terminated in 1848, and not in 1852; and the first edition of his Hebrew Grammar was published in 1813, and not in 1821. Some of these mistakes are of minor importance, and no doubt, due to the proof-reader. We know from experience how difficult it is, with all our care, to make the types always speak with entire accuracy.

*Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia. Revelations II, III.* By Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Dean of Westminster. New York: Charles Scribner, 1862. All who are familiar with the productions of Dr. Trench would naturally expect a valuable exposition on this difficult portion of Divine revelation. He is a man of great learning, and his works are generally characterized by sound judgment, critical analysis, philological research and clear interpretation. This may be regarded as one of his best productions, and although we do not agree with the learned author in all his speculations, the book abounds in original thought and is full of profitable suggestions.

*History of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables:* A synchronistic view of the events, characteristics and culture of each period, including the history of polity, worship, literature and doctrines, together with two supplementary tables upon the Church in America, and an Appendix, containing the series of councils, patriarchs and other bishops, and a full index. By Henry B. Smith, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the city of New York. Revised edition, New York: Charles Scribner, 1861. We have examined these Tables with care, and with much satisfaction. They possess very great value, and may be used as a most convenient work for study and reference, not only by ministers of the Gospel and Theological students, but by all who are interested in the History of the Christian Church. The work is a kind of

Manual in the form of Synchronistic Tables, but differs from a Manual, in giving in parallel columns, the various departments of the history in each period. It differs also from ordinary Tables, in presenting not only dates and facts, but also a digest of the subject matter, in accordance with the best and latest authorities. The preparation of such a work requires a variety and depth of learning, ecclesiastical and scholastic, for which Professor Smith, by study and professional labor, is eminently fitted.

*Lessons in Life:* A Series of Familiar Essays by Timothy Titcomb, New York: Charles Scribner, 1861. We are not at all surprised, that Dr. Holland's writings have been so popular. They are marked by good sense and contain most valuable truth and practical wisdom, expressed in natural and vigorous language, with so much vivid description of human life and genial sympathy with humanity, that the author will continue to be a favorite, and his productions do good.

*Practical Christianity.* A Treatise, specially designed for Young Men. By John S. C. Abbott. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1862. These pages have been written with special reference to young men, who are thoughtless on the subject of religion, and cannot be persuaded to read standard books upon Christianity, for the purpose of awakening an interest in their minds in reference to the most ennobling and sublime themes, that can be presented to the human mind. Few writers surpass the author, in the natural simplicity of his style, the truthfulness of his illustrations and the deep interest of his narratives. His productions charm the young and the old, whilst the noble precepts inculcated cannot fail to impress the heart and exert the most healthful moral influence.

*Autobiography of William Neill, D.D.* With a selection from his Sermons. By the Rev. J. H. Jones, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1861. Dr. Neill occupied a prominent position in the Presbyterian Church, and was highly esteemed by all evangelical deuominations for his personal worth and lovely Christian character. The Autobiography gives not only a narrative of the author's life, but his views on many important questions, connected with education and religion. The sermons are practical and earnest exhibitions of Divine truth, just such as we would expect from the pen of a pure, faithful and devoted minister of the Gospel.

*Twelve Discourses.* By Henry Martyn Dexter. Boston, 1860. These are able discourses, deserving the permanent form, given to them in the beautiful volume before us. They are marked by originality, by a devout, earnest spirit, and are highly suggestive. The topics presented are of the deepest interest and very suitable to the discussions of the pulpit.

*Street Thoughts.* By Rev. H. M. Dexter, Pastor of the Pine Street Church, Boston. With Illustrations. 1859. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co., 1859. This little book has been for some time before the public. It is a work of merit, full of valuable truth and exhibits an acquaintance with human nature in its various phases. The subjects discussed are those connected with every day life and were suggested to the author by incidents, which came to his notice in passing through the streets of the crowded city.

*Poems with Autobiographic and other Notes.* Illustrated by Darley, Hoppin and others. By T. H. Stockton, Chaplain to Congress. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien. 1862. Dr. Stockton is acknowledged by all, as a man of original genius. He seems to be peculiarly

gifted, and his qualities of mind and heart have always won admiration and secured esteem. As a pulpit orator he is best known to the public, having occupied important positions in the Church and, on several occasions, been elected as Chaplain to Congress. The gifts of the author are also manifest in his poetic productions. They are full of fine imagery, of elevated thought, of the purest and most patriotic sentiments, clothed in choice and appropriate language.

*Mistakes of Educated Men.* By John Hart, LL. D., Editor of the Sunday School Times, late Principal of the Philadelphia High School, etc., etc. Second Edition, Philadelphia: J. C. Garrigues, 1862. This sterling address, delivered before the Phrenakosmian Society of Pennsylvania College at the last Annual Commencement, was, at the time, received with marked favor. A second edition of the work was soon called for, in order to supply the great demand, and we are glad to see it given to the public in so attractive a form. The production is one of rare excellence, containing the results of long experience and careful observation in the department of life, to which it refers, and presenting a series of practical instructions and valuable suggestions, worthy the consideration of all literary and professional men. The vigorous thought and earnest words, the lucid style and striking illustrations, are calculated to arrest the attention and make an impression.

*Rebellion Record.* Several numbers of this valuable publication have reached us, since our last notice. We have no reason to retract the favorable opinion we then expressed. The documents here gathered will be useful for reference, whilst the beautiful steel engravings, the maps and diagrams, which accompany the work, give to it additional interest.

*Harper's Magazine.* This popular monthly makes its appearance with great regularity and with its usual variety of interesting matter. The last numbers are exceedingly attractive. Its numerous elegant illustrations, so creditable to American art, and its valuable contents give it a most prominent position among periodicals of its peculiar character.

*The Atlantic Monthly.* This magazine has entered upon its ninth volume with a large number of excellent articles. From the commencement of its career, it has maintained a high literary standard, and the list of contributors embraces some of our most popular and talented authors. Whilst we have occasionally objected to an article, we always find much, which our judgment approves.

*The Day of the Lord:* A Lecture, delivered in St. John's (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia, the twenty-sixth Sunday after Trinity, A. D., 1861. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D.

Remarks at the Funeral of Henry Horn, Philadelphia, January 16th 1862. By J. A. Seiss, D. D.

*Thanksgiving Sermon:* A Specific Remedy for National Calamities Preached in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Mendon, N. Y., Nov. 28th, 1861. By Rev. N. Van Alstine.

"*Wait!*" A Sermon, on the death of Joseph M. King, a member of the graduating class of 1861. By S. Sprecher, D. D., President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, O.

*The Great Rebellion:* A Discourse, delivered at Camp Meigs, October 13th, 1861. By Rev. G. Stelling, A, M., of the Lutheran Church, New Phil. O.

Sermon, delivered in the Lutheran Churches of the Blain Charge on the National Fast Day, September 26th 1861. By Rev. J. T. Williams.

*The Coward's Curse and Patriot's Duty:* A discourse delivered, Sept. 18th 1861, in the Lutheran Church, Centreville, Pa. By Rev. A. L. Guss. A. M.

# INDEX TO VOL. XIII.


Abbott's Practical Christianity, 597
American Board for Foreign Missions,..... 454
American Sunday School Union's Publications,..... 310
American Theological Review, 155
American Tract Society's Publications,..... 310
Ancient Hebrews,..... 311
Annotations on Matt. 24,..... 55
Atlantic Monthly,..... 598
Autobiography of Dr. Neill,... 597
Baltzly's Funeral Discourse,... 310
Bearing of Ministers in Time of War,..... 457
Beneficiary Education,..... 111
Berkenmeyer, Rev. W. C.,..... 362
Bible and Geology,..... 173
Bible Glossary,..... 248
Bibliotheca Sacra,..... 154
Bittinger Rev. J. B., Art. by,.. 248
Bittinger's Fast Day Sermon,.. 456
Brief Survey of the Lutheran Church,..... 156
Brownson's Quarterly,..... 156
Call to the Christian Ministry, 412
Carmina Ecclesiæ,..... 184
Cases of Conscience,..... 309
Caspari's Schoolmaster,..... 454
Christianity, imperishableness of 515
Christian Ministry,..... 412
Christian Patriot,..... 456
Church Theses,.....267, 122
Cleveland's Classical Literature,..... 455
Conditions of Intellectual Success,..... 310
Coppée, Prof. H. Art. by ...93, 543
Danville Quarterly,..... 155
Davis' Carthage,..... 451
Dexter's Discourses,..... 598
Dexter's Street Thoughts,..... 598
Dickson, Rev. Dr., Art. by..... 161
Discourse on Spiritual Worship of God,..... 156
Discourses on Sacramental Occasions,..... 154
Dissensions among Christians, 436
Dox, Rev. H. L., Art by ..... 412
Du Chaillu's Explorations,..... 450
Ellicott's Historical Lectures,.. 595
Emigration to North America, 1
English History, Races in,..... 93
Essick, Rev. A. Art by,..... 173
Exposition of Matt. 19 : 24,.... 264
Exposition of Rom. 8 : 33–39,.. 429
Faith once delivered to the Saints,..... 156
Felix, Minucius,..... 34
Fichte, J. G.,..... 386
Fink, Rev. R. A. Art. by,..... 292
French History, Races in,..... 543
Geology and the Bible,..... 173
German Emigration to North America,..... 1
Greenwald, Rev. Dr. Art. by,.. 355
Government and Christianity,. 156
Hagenbach's History of Doctrines,..... 596
Harper's Classical Series,...309, 451
Harper's Magazine,..... 598
Hart's Mistakes of Educated Men,..... 598
Hebrews, Slavery among the, 311
Helfenstein's Sermons,..... 452
Herder, J. G.,..... 473
Hymns from the German, 151, 307 449
Imperishableness of Christianity,..... 515
Isaac Blessing Jacob,..... 375
Janeway's Memoir,..... 452
Jephthah's Vow,..... 28
Joy of Tribulation,..... 456
Koons, Rev. E. J. Art. by,..... 581
Krauth, Rev. Dr. Art by,..... 429
Leaves from the Tree of Life, 455
Lobdell's Memoir,..... 452
Loy, Art. by,.....151 299
Lutheran Almanac,..... 456

Lutheran Church and Missions 156
Lutheran Church in this Country, ..... 156
Luther's Works,..... 581
Maclay's Life among the Chinese, ..... 309
Marcus Minucius Felix, ..... 34
Matth. 6 : 25–34, Exposition of, 355
Matth. 19 : 24, Exposition of, .. 204
Matth. 24 : Annotations on,..... 55
Memorial of Lancaster Church 595
Memorial Volume of Missions, 454
Miller, Rev. Dr., ..... 561
Ministerial Office, ..... 299
Ministers in Times of War, ... 456
Mistakes of Educated Men, ... 456
Motley's Netherlands, ..... 308
Muhlenberg, Prof. F. A., Art. by, ..... 122, 267
National Crisis, ..... 134
Nature of Ordination, ..... 292
Nevin's Biblical Antiquities, . 455
Notices of New Publications, 154, 308, 450, 595
Ordination, Nature of, ..... 292
Our Country in the Light of History, ..... 456
Our National Crisis, ..... 134
Parvin's Notes on the Gospels 455
Perseverance in Study, ..... 156
Plitt, Rev. J. K., Art. by, ..... 375
Prayer-Meeting, ..... 164
Pulpit and Rostrum, ..... 456
Puritans,..... 595
Purposes of God in the American Union, ..... 156
Question at Issue, ..... 161
Races of Men in English History,..... 93
Races of Men in French History, ..... 543
Rebellion Record, ..... 452, 598
Rebellious Nation reproved, .. 456
Remarks on Matth. 6 : 25—34, 355
Renovation of Politics,..... 156
Reynolds, Rev. Dr., Art. by, 1, 134
Romans 8 : 33–39, Exposition of, ..... 429
Ruthrauff, Rev. F.,..... 570
Sacramental Discourses,..... 154
Safford's Memoir,..... 454
Schaeffer, Rev. Dr., Art. by,... 55
Schmidt, Rev. Dr., Art. by,.... 311
Schoolmaster and his Son,..... 454
Sheeleigh, Rev., Art. by, 307, 449
Slavery among the Ancient Hebrews,..... 311
Smith's Chronological Tables, 596
Soldier's Pocket Library, ..... 310
Sommer, Rev. Peter Nicholas, 370
South Pacific Adventures, ..... 451
Sprecher, Rev. Dr., Art. by,... 515
State of the Country, ..... 161
Stockton's Poems, ..... 598
Stuckenberg, Rev. J. H. W., Art. by, ..... 386, 473
Sunday School Class-Book, .... 456
Teacher Taught, ..... 310
Teacher Teaching, ..... 310
Ten Reasons for attending Worship,..... 456
Titcomb's Lessons in Life, .... 597
Theses upon the Church, 122, 267
Thorpe, Prof. H. W., Art. by, 34
Threatening Ruin of our Times,..... 156
Trembling for the Ark of God, 156
Trench's Commentary,..... 596
Two Records of Creation, ..... 173
Wenzel, Rev. G. A., Art. by, ... 457
Worcester's Dictionary,..... 455
Worship of God, Spiritual, .... 156